

PUBLIC LIBRARY

AUG 12 1919

DETROIT.

NOTICE TO READER
When you finish reading a magazine bearing this notice, place
a 1-cent stamp on this notice, mail the magazine, and it will be
placed in the hands of our soldiers, sailors or marines.

NO WRAPPING—NO ADDRESS

A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster General.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

AUGUST 9, 1919

PRICE TEN CENTS

Forcing Frames of Freedom

J. C. Walsh

Staff Correspondent of "America" in Ireland

Southern Slav Religious Festival

E. Christitch

Serbian Red Cross Worker

The Real Meaning of Bolshevism

S. A. Baldus

Managing Editor, "Extension Magazine"

Jesuit Explorer and "Cattle-King"

John C. Reville

Associate Editor, "America"

Senator Smith Shatters the Silence

Paul L. Blakely

Associate Editor, "America"

THE AMERICA PRESS

NEW YORK CITY

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1919

VOLUME XXI. No. 18

Published weekly by The America Press,
173 East 83rd Street, New York

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

CONTENTS

CHRONICLE 437-440

TOPICS OF INTEREST

Forcing Frames of Freedom—South-
ern Slav Religious Festival—The Real
Meaning of Bolshevism—Famine in
India—Hamlet and the Bible...441-450

COMMUNICATIONS450-451

EDITORIALS

Washington and Chicago—Profiteers
and the People—"Can Ireland Stand
Alone?"—Jury Trial and the "Rabid
Drys"—The Passing of Dr. Eliot—
Powder-and-Paint Engagements..452-454

LITERATURE

Jesuit Explorer and "Cattle-King"—
Reviews—Books and Authors...455-457

EDUCATION

Senator Smith Shatters the Silence..
458-459

SOCIOLOGY

The Limits of Public Ownership..459-460

NOTE AND COMMENT.....460

CONTINENTAL HOTEL

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

Tennessee Avenue, near Beach; 200 feet
from St. Nicholas' Catholic Church; always
open; private bath; running water in rooms;
elevator; excellent table; white service;
American plan; \$3.50 up daily; \$17.50 up
weekly. European plan, \$1.50 up daily
Booklets. Garage.
M. WALSH DUNCAN.H. J. BUTLER & CO.
Inc.Ecclesiastical Decorations, Stained Glass,
Statuary, Stations of the Cross, Altar Orna-
ments, Lighting Fixtures, and Chancel
Furniture.

AEOLIAN HALL

33 West 42nd St. New York City

D'YOUVILLE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

BUFFALO, N. Y.

*The Only College for Women in Western New York
Founded and Directed by the Grey Nuns*Chartered with fullest degree conferring powers by special act of New
York State Legislature. Registered with the University of the State of
New York. Courses leading to degrees in Arts and Sciences, Philosophy,
Pedagogy and Music. Courses of instruction and diplomas awarded in
Design and Painting. Special preparation for High School and College
teaching. Secretarial Course.

New York State Teachers' License

ST. MARY COLLEGE
DAYTON, OHIOConducted by the Society of Mary
Only Catholic Boarding College
for Young Men in OhioCollege of Arts and Letters. Pre-Medical
Engineering: Chemical, Electrical, Me-
chanical, Civil, High School and Com-
mercial Departments.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Extensive grounds, fifteen acres of
campus, gymnasium, dormitory buildings
with private rooms, completely equipped
laboratories and libraries.Separate Building for College Students
Write for Illustrated Catalogue and Bulletin
Rev. Joseph A. Tetzlaff, S. M., President.

Father Tom

*A life of the Reverend Thomas P.
McLoughlin, together with a num-
ber of addresses and sermons deliv-
ered by him on various occasions*

By PETER P. McLOUGHLIN

The interesting biography of a
noted priest, lecturer and singer
that will be eagerly welcomed
by his countless admirers and
friends. People of all denomi-
nations, in all walks of life, who
had the good fortune to work
with him and to know him, loved
"Father Tom."

Illustrated, 8vo

At all booksellers, \$2.50 net New York
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS LondonLOYOLA
COLLEGE

MONTREAL CANADA

An English College under the
direction of the Jesuit Fathers.Ideal location. Spacious grounds.
Beautiful, new, fireproof build-
ings. Terms moderate.

Write for prospectus to

Rev. William H. Hingston, S.J., Rector

CARLTON ACADEMY

COLLEGE PREPARATORY
FOR BOYSSeparate Buildings for Lower and
Upper Schools. Lay Instructors. Resi-
dent Chaplain. Individual Attention.
Athletics. Gymnasium. Military Drill

LIMITED TO FIFTY BOARDERS

Rev. JAMES F. NEWCOMB, Headmaster
SUMMIT, N. J.

BROWN'S

Series of Grammars

For Elementary and Advanced Grades

Brown's First Lines of English Grammar—
Kiddle36 cents
Brown's First Lessons in Language and Gram-
mar—Hall40 cents
Brown's Elementary Grammar—Davis..40 cents
Brown's Institutes of English Grammar—Kiddle
.....50 cents
Brown's Institutes of English Grammar—
Davis50 cents
Brown's Grammar of English Grammars..\$5.00
(For teachers' use and reference work)
Most, if not all, of the more recently
compiled grammars of merit have Gould
Brown as the basis of their construction.

WILLIAM WOOD & CO.

Publishers 51 Fifth Ave., New York

PASTORS!

Order 100 Gross Votive Lights and Save \$25

Our price delivered to any railroad station
in the United States is \$325.00 for 100 grossBurn in Red, Green, White or Blue Vigil Light Glasses with a
bright, steady light for 8 hours.
Trial Order of 9 Gross at same rate, delivered, freight paid
\$3.25 gross—total \$29.25. In order to secure this unprecedented
offer, cash must accompany the order.

THE KAUFER CO., Catholic Supply House, Seattle, Wash.

We recommend this firm as reliable. Have used these Votive
Lights and found them satisfactory. Redemptorist Fathers, 6th
and Bell, Seattle, Washington.

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXI. No. 18 }
WHOLE No. 518 }

AUGUST 9, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR }

Chronicle

Peace Settlement.—The New Socialistic Government of Hungary, which was set up in succession to the Bela Kun régime, entered during the week into negotiations with the Allies for a peace settlement.

Bela Kun's Downfall

Bela Kun resigned his virtual dictatorship of Hungary July 31 and received a safe conduct from the Allies. He took refuge in Vienna as it was felt that his life would be endangered were he to remain in Budapest. His fall was brought about by the success of the Rumanians along the River Theiss, and the complete rout of the Hungarian Red army. Much of the credit for Bela Kun's fall is given to Captain Thomas C. Gregory, the United States Food Administrator, who arranged for food relief for Budapest, brought supplies from the Banat region and hurried them down the Danube from Austria. The peace overtures to the Allies were made by Jacob Weltner, President of the Soldiers' and Workers' Soviet of Hungary. Arriving in Vienna from Budapest, Herr Weltner asked Colonel Cunningham, the Allies' representative at that capital, to recognize the new Government and to treat for peace. A new cabinet was immediately formed; it is supposed, however, that it will not be permanent, but is organized solely to hold the reins until the regular cabinet is formed. The Cabinet as now constituted has at its head Jules Peidil, former Minister of the People's Welfare in the Karolyi Cabinet. He has been a typographer, editor and model worker, and is reported to be a courageous man of simple habits. Joseph Haubrich, said to be an anti-Communist, is Minister of War; the Minister of Finance is Joseph Miskics. Through the Italian mission at Budapest, the new Cabinet sent a message to the Peace Conference asking the establishment of relations with that body. In reply the Conference stated that it expected that the new Government would comply with the terms of the armistice and hoped that the establishment of an orderly government in Hungary would soon make possible the resumption of economic relations. In the Conference circles, the new Hungarian Government is looked upon as moderate in views.

Home News.—On July 29 the President laid before the Senate the text of the special treaty between the

United States and France. Under the terms of this document, signed at Versailles on June 28, the United States pledges itself to go to the aid of France in

French Treaty Goes to Senate

the case of any unprovoked movement of aggression made against her by Germany. The President did not present the treaty in person. Instead he sent a personal written message accompanying the document. In the message Mr. Wilson declared that America was bound by a debt of gratitude to France to ratify as speedily as possible the treaty thus submitted, under which the pledge of military aid is given to France. By unanimous consent the treaty was laid before the Senate in open session at the request of Senator Lodge, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The document was laid before the Senate after complaint had been made by several members that the President had not submitted the official draft along with the general treaty of peace signed at Versailles. Some of the members claimed that Mr. Wilson had violated that clause of the Versailles pact which declared that the French treaty "will be submitted to the Senate of the United States at the same time as the Treaty of Versailles is submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification." The Franco-American pact is almost identical with the treaty negotiated between France and England. The British treaty says that Great Britain "consents" to assist France. The treaty between the United States and France declares that "the United States of America shall be bound to come immediately to her assistance in the event of any unprovoked movement of aggression against her being made by Germany."

On August 2 representatives of four railroad brotherhoods, headed by Warren S. Stone, Grand Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, notified Congress that the 2,000,000 organized railroad employees, whose views they represent, were "in no mood to brook the return of the lines to their former control." They also declared that in their opinion widespread economic disaster could not be avoided unless the Government purchased the railway systems and through appropriate legislation provided for their operation on terms by which

the employees would share in the earnings. While this statement, which the labor leaders said had been indorsed by the American Federation of Labor, was being made, Representative Sims, Democrat, and former Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting on behalf of the brotherhoods, placed before Congress a bill incorporating the features of the so-called Plumb plan, which, according to the railroad employees, would satisfy their demands and go far to solve the problem of the high cost of living. A statement issued on behalf of the intended Government Ownership bill thus summarizes it: Purchase by the Government on valuation as determined by the courts; operation by directorate of fifteen, five to be chosen by the President to represent the public, five to be elected by the operating officials, and five by the classified employees; equal division of surplus, after paying fixed charges and operating costs, between the public and the employees; automatic reduction of rates when the employees' share of surplus is more than five per cent of the gross operating revenue; regional operation as a unified system; building of extensions at the expense of the communities benefited, in proportion to the benefit.

From the President down every branch of the Government has turned its attention to the momentous question of the high cost of living. The committee of three which *The Government and the High Cost of Living* was appointed at the conference of Cabinet officers and other officials called by Attorney General Palmer to discuss a cure for the growing and almost intolerable evil, is studying out a constructive program to be soon issued. Steps to bring down the price of wheat as well as of other grains and foodstuffs will be part of the Government program as well as drastic action against illicit speculation and profiteering. It is also possible that legislation by Congress may be brought into play to meet the situation. The War Department announced on August 2 that sales of surplus War Department food direct to the public through the parcel post, will begin Monday, August 18.

France.—The question of the resumption of diplomatic relations between France and the Vatican has been steadily occupying a larger place in the minds not merely of the French public but of French legislators. The question has been regularly recurring in the Chamber of Deputies, but the climax was reached on July 2, during the discussion of the budget for foreign affairs. M. Jean Bon, whom *La Croix* calls "the most accomplished of Parliamentary clowns," in the course of a review of the different parts of the world, came at last to Rome, and launched out into a diatribe against Pope Benedict XV, Pius X, Cardinal Amette and other ecclesiastics. There were indignant protests, but the matter would have assumed little importance had not M. de Monzie, an independent Socialist, who has consistently advocated

the necessity of reconciliation with the Vatican, taken up the discussion. M. de Monzie is a freethinker and a determined supporter of the régime of which separation of Church and State is the principal feature. Nevertheless he is firmly convinced of the advisability of establishing official relations with the Holy See. After reviewing the devices to which France had been obliged to resort in order to keep in touch with Vatican diplomacy, for example the mission of M. Charles Loiseau at Rome, the use of the British Ambassador to the Holy See, the appointment of M. Frontenac to represent the Principality of Monaco at the Vatican, an appointment which he said had for its real purpose the defense of French interests, M. de Monzie reaffirmed his detestation for the Papacy, but pointed out how illogical it was for France to resort to such expedients to protect its interests. He then asked why France did not employ direct and official means of representation at the Papal Court instead of the indirect and oblique methods which had been found indispensable for the past four years and more.

At this point in de Monzie's speech, M. Viviani made a sensational interruption in which he took exception to some of the premises of the speaker, but ended with the words: "But I am not in disagreement with your conclusion; republican and devoted to the lay régime, I am not shocked at the idea of seeing former relations with the Vatican resumed, after consultation with the Chamber." After M. de Monzie had concluded his discourse, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Pichon, made this clear declaration of the Government's policy:

The Government believes that the law of 1905 [the law of Separation of Church and State] suffices for all needs. Certain persons, among them M. de Monzie, would like to establish in addition official relations with the Holy See. I say, gentlemen, clearly and exactly, that the Government is not of the opinion that it can undertake any such initiative. It does not find that circumstances warrant it in assuming any such responsibility. The policy of separation, such as exists at present, suffices for the Government.

M. Pichon concluded by declaring that the Holy See had its own interest in protecting French interests without official relations, and that Catholics would do their duty by their country without any official representation at the Vatican. M. Grousseau protested that this policy of abstention from official relations was "a national crime," but M. Pichon again asserted that the French Government would enter into no sort of diplomacy with the Vatican.

Catholics are naturally much incensed over the remarks of M. Pichon, and a large part of the press, irrevocably anti-clerical, has protested against the inexpediency of the Government's persisting in its unwise policy. Hervé, writing in the *Victoire*, does not hesitate to predict that the next Chamber, no matter who may be president of the Council, will reestablish the embassy to the Vatican.

Great Britain.—The Lord Mayor of Liverpool was obliged to call upon the military to preserve order in consequence of the police strike in the city of Liverpool on August 2. Following the example of the London authorities the officials of the city expelled striking police officers. The strike spread to Birkenhead on the Mersey opposite Liverpool. In the latter city it is estimated that 652 policemen are on strike and in London the number is 833, according to the report of Government officials. The shops of jewelers and merchants were looted, and it was found necessary to dispatch lorries filled with troops to the scene of disturbance.

As a part of the solution of the general labor difficulty the Government attempted to come to an understanding with the Yorkshire miners. The Yorkshire

The Yorkshire Miners' Council representing more than 200,000 miners rejected the proposal made by the Government and decided to continue the strike. Associated press reports declare that the British mines and railways are in bad financial condition. Sir Eric Geddes recently told the House of Commons that the transport systems of the country are in a "semi-paralyzed state." The railways and the mines have had a constant deficit to meet since the beginning of the war. The deficit of the railways has been defrayed from the treasury, ultimately by the taxpayer, while the whole community has met the deficit of the mines through official advances in the price of coal.

Two new Labor bills are about to be presented in Parliament. They are the result of an agreement between representatives of employers, trade unions and the Minister of Labor acting as a joint board. **Two New Labor Bills** The first bill calls for the appointment of a commission to decide on a minimum wage to meet the present high cost of living. The second bill is intended to make forty-eight hours constitute a week's work.

Ireland.—In the course of his western tour President De Valera made clear the object of his coming to America. At a banquet given in his honor in San Francisco he insisted on the importance of organization, declaring that nothing could have been accomplished in Ireland had there not been organization with a "democratic foundation from the bottom up." The high ideals voiced by President Wilson would never be attained without organization, and the men of Irish blood throughout the world could further such a movement:

I came here because I felt that I wanted an organization in America to further the recognition of the Irish Republic. I want you to tell your American friends about Ireland and ask them to assist. I have two objectives: Securing official recognition for Ireland and preventing Ireland from being put in a worse state in the future than it has been in the past.

I want you to put a portion of your organization at our disposal in order that the Irish national bonds which we shall issue

here shall be sold. These bonds will be used for the broadest national purpose. The money will be as much at the disposal of the Orangemen from the North as the Catholic men of the South. I wish to combine every section of the Irish people to do for themselves what England has never done—improve the natural resources of the country.

Every man who buys a bond has a share in the Irish nation. I could raise the necessary amount of money by subscription, but choose this method because I want you to be sharers in the Irish Republic as a reminder that you shall work. It shall be a labor of love with you.

The city of San Francisco officially recognized the Irish Republic and at St. Peter's church President De Valera received the courtesies due to a Catholic ruler. During Solemn High Mass he was seated on the Gospel side of the sanctuary, attended by a military guard of honor and assisted by two priests acting as chaplains.

Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the Commission on Irish Independence, offers to prove the charges of brutality set forth in the report of the three American delegates **British Misrule and the Commission Report** and sweepingly denied by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Ian Macpherson. Mr. Walsh calls for an impartial

court to sit upon the evidence contained in the commission report. The chief charges denied by the British Government were that prisoners had been confined in animal cages, that some were driven insane by cruel treatment while others fell victims to pneumonia due to the cold water torture administered. "These and other charges we are ready to substantiate by the testimony of disinterested witnesses," Mr. Walsh stated to the press.

Japan.—The recent address of M. Yamamoto at the dinner of the Corporation of Christian Publicists in Paris threw a great deal of light on the status of the Catholic missions in Japan. Besides the Catholics there are at least twenty different Protestant sects carrying on evangelical efforts in the island. The Catholic Church has 55 native priests, Protestantism has 1,570 native ministers; there are all told 160 Catholic missionaries and 650 heretical and schismatical missionaries; Catholic churches and chapels number 160, non-Catholic places of worship number 1,240; the Catholic body has 70,400 members, the others 117,600. Few Catholic Japanese fail to practise their religion, many Protestant Japanese seldom if ever go to church.

M. Yamamoto, who is a fervent Catholic convert, pointed out that there is need today of vigorous Catholic propaganda, and among other reasons for this assigns the following: the influence of German materialism, which has done so much to shake the foundations of religious and moral foundations in Japan, is at present neutralized by the disfavor in which all things German have fallen; Protestantism is spreading rapidly, and once a Protestant, the Japanese is very difficult to convert; the prestige of Japan is very great in the Far East, and the influence, both in material and moral things, exercised by her over her neighbors is enormous, Indians,

Filipinos, Chinese and other Orientals flocking to Tokio to find inspiration and direction; if Japan should become Catholic, other Eastern nations would probably follow in her wake.

The conversion of Japan, according to M. Yamamoto, is possible provided it takes place at once. His reasons for holding this opinion cover a wide range: the blood of the martyrs in that land has not yet borne fruit; the sacrifices and labors of the missionaries have not been recompensed; the prayers and sacrifices of religious men and women offered for Japan's conversion cannot remain unanswered; the consecration of the country to the Sacred Heart cannot be in vain; the Holy See is making special efforts in Japan's behalf; the victory of the Entente has strongly affected the dominant class; the heroism, patriotism and endurance displayed by Catholics during the war, has disarmed some prejudice; the Japanese are well disposed toward their Catholic compatriots; extraordinary vocations and remarkable conversions give good hope for the future; the Association of Catholic Youth at Tokio is the nucleus of a great Catholic movement; the morality of the women, contrary to current reports, is high, especially when it is taken into account that they belong to a pagan race; they practise many of the virtues dearest to Christianity and are inclined to become Catholics.

The obstacles to the spread of Catholicism in Japan are also clearly set down by M. Yamamoto. First there is the harm done by Protestant missionaries, who are regarded with disdain by the Japanese because they are, at times, of mediocre families, are married, intent rather on enriching themselves than on spreading the Gospel, more interested in trade than in conversions, and content to baptize all comers without instruction merely to augment the number of Protestants. Unhappily Catholic priests are confused with them, since the Japanese do not trouble to make distinctions. Another difficulty is the fact that Protestants have not infrequently engaged in politics, especially in Korea. This has annoyed both the people and the Government, and has reacted on Catholics. The Japanese have gained their knowledge of history through atheistic or Protestant sources, and so have imbibed the prejudices with which such books are filled. A serious obstacle is lack of resources, together with a wholly inadequate number of missionaries. The diocese of Tokio, for instance, has 16,000,000 people, and for their conversion there is only one archbishop, twenty-five missionaries, of whom about twelve are absent on account of the war, and two Japanese priests; all of these are engaged, and necessarily, rather in ministering to well-instructed Catholics than in instructing pagans. The last obstacle, which M. Yamamoto insists on, is the absence of religious propaganda through the medium of the press; to meet the attacks of Protestants and pagans the Catholics have but one daily paper. Protestants on account of their wealth and number are well off in the matter of the press.

Russia.—Last week several prominent men gave their views about the present condition of Russia. Mr. David R. Francis, American Ambassador to Russia, believes

*The Country's
Present State*

that unless the League of Nations helps the Russian people to select a government and then sees that it is supported, the country will quickly go to ruin and drag down the rest of the world with her. He estimates that Lenin does not represent more than one-tenth of Russia's 180,000,000 population. Mr. Francis continued:

The Russians are tired of fighting. Men are compelled to serve in the Bolshevik army by a tyranny as relentless as that of the Czar's Government. It is the only means of staving off starvation for men in the cities. They must serve the dictatorship or starve. If the decision of the League were given to the Kolchak Government, and to the other anti-Bolshevist forces, there would be enough men in the Bolshevik territories who would welcome the help to obtain their freedom.

Mr. Boris Bakhmeteff, who may be considered Russia's Ambassador, by default, to the United States, on returning to Washington after an eight months' sojourn in Paris looks back "with confidence and satisfaction" on the late progress of events in Russia. He finds that since last December when anti-Bolshevist groups were struggling independently of one another conditions are improved. For now

A great unifying effort has been exerted. As a result, all the regional formations have recognized the Government of Admiral Kolchak as the Russian Government, and have pledged loyalty and subservency. The armies which are fighting in Siberia, in the South, in the North, and around the Baltic are but parts of one huge military body gaining in organization and unity of command. Moreover, the purpose of national action has been defined and announced beyond misapprehension. Its aim is to save the country from moral and material ruin and give the people of Russia the opportunity to establish their destinies according to their own choice through a freely elected Constituent Assembly.

The process of healing and reconstitution has clearly revealed itself. The national movement has found its own and found its leader. The outcome is certain—a country liberated from anarchy and national life reconstituted on firm foundations of law and self-government. Another most important point is the definition of policy toward Russia which has found expression in the recent exchange of correspondence between the Powers and Admiral Kolchak. An end has been put to hesitation and uncertainty. It has done away with the prospect and attempt to solve the Russian problem through "persuasion of Bolshevism." The Powers have openly proclaimed that reconstitution of Russia is bound to the success of the national movement. Admiral Kolchak has been acknowledged as the leader of National Russia and the Powers have pledged their support and assistance to his Government.

Colonel Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons, July 29, undertook to defend England's policy in Russia, promising that "British troops would be removed from North Russia at the earliest possible moment consistent with their safety and British honor." He said that failure to support Kolchak and Denekin would have strengthened the Bolsheviks and developed a formidable situation. For the Bolshevik forces, if unattacked, would have made war on new weak states.

Forcing Frames of Freedom

J. C. WALSH

Staff Correspondent of "AMERICA" in Ireland

THE battle of Aughrim was fought on the land of one O'Kelly, who had managed somehow to keep possession when Cromwell was taking the land of Ireland away from the Irish. O'Kelly was a "practical" man. He believed in making the best of his farm and fought shy of the perils to which he thought a plain farmer was exposed by participation in politics. He had a model farm, to whose production and increasing fertility he gave unceasing and intelligent attention. One of the old Irish bards whose chanted story of the Williamite wars has come down to us, devoted a rather bitter quatrain to the worthy man. O'Kelly's fields, he sang, are now all that his heart would wish. They will never lack for plentiful manuring from this time forward. There is enough of the rotting carcasses of men and of horses on them to fertilize them forever. Och, ochone—O'Kelly's well-tended highly-producing fields were given to one of William's soldiers.

In Ireland they have long recognized,—as where is it not recognized?—that their ability to achieve their high resolves is in direct ratio to the willingness with which they bear the resulting inconveniences and to their determination not to be denied. When Ireland asked Parliament in the famine years for an order to close the ports and feed the people from the harvest—and got a coercion act, there was a rebellion and the leaders of Ireland were deported as felons. The seemingly hopeless demand for disestablishment of an alien church sustained by levies upon a people it did not serve brought into existence the Fenians, men not soft in will. The movement, springing from a peasant tenantry, by which the Irish land was re-won, was probably the highest single achievement passive resistance has to its credit, but Michael Davitt did not begin that movement until he and the constitutionalist leaders had enlisted the support of John Devoy, Matt Harris of Ballinasloe, Patrick Egan, and many a man hidden away in quiet corners of Ireland whose temper had been hardened and whose fiber had been tested in the earlier struggle. Today the friendliest thing one hears said about the Maxwell régime is that in putting Pearse and Connolly and the others out of the way those who represented the English intention to rule Ireland as a conquered province paid the highest compliment of which they were capable to those who faced them with their own methods of force.

What is perfectly patent in Ireland now is that, if the elected of Irish constituencies stay away from Westminster, set up a government of their own, and address themselves with every show of confidence to the development of Ireland in all its attributes as a nation, despite the presence in Dublin of a foreign government backed by an army of occupation, it is the dispersion

all over Ireland of men who have been confined with them in English prisons upon which they must and do depend for that solidarity without which they could have no great hope of success. "Labor in Ireland," George Russell (AE.) explained to me, "has advanced by leaps and bounds since James Connolly gave Labor a martyr." Afterwards I stood with one of the Labor leaders in Liberty Hall in front of a map in which the progress of the Labor movement was charted. "It seems to me," I commented, at one point in the conversation, "that there is in all this much that fortifies the Nationalist movement, but also, given certain conditions, some potential of disruption." "Quite true," was the reply. "This is a Labor movement, a necessary thing, as we see it. When Connolly died, there were five centers. Now there are eight hundred. A new adhesion has been telephoned to me since we have been talking. We must adhere to our definite ideals, and we do, and doubtless there are plenty who do not like them or like us. I know that efforts will be made to turn us against the Dail. For the last three months they have been at it. But take my case. I was not in the Labor ranks before or during the rising. I was with the Volunteers. Afterwards I spent six months in prison with De Valera. Now he is there and I am here, and do you think they can make a cleavage between us? There are literally thousands of us who, in English prisons and under the eyes of English jailers, have thought out and talked out the present problems of Ireland, and while some are in our movement and some are not, we have carried to all Ireland the gospel learned in those seminaries which they called our prisons, where they thought by offense to our bodies they could break our spirit." De Valera's only word to those who lead single phases of the movement is, "Be careful only lest you be tempted to substitute some other inspiration for that of Ireland." I think I can fairly say that at Plunkett House itself, and in the published books of some of its inmates, I have found as much accurate and detailed information touching the restrictive influence of English commercial domination upon Irish development as at the offices of the Dail. But there are no martyrs or prisoners behind Plunkett House. If the relief they seek is obtained, it will be conceded to the determination of the others.

George Russell, I must say, I found with as healthy an Irish fury in his breast as any of them. The last time I left him he was bursting with scorn of the Unionist delegation which had gone over to London to warn the timid English of the baleful presence in Ireland of 1,083 co-operative soviets, that being precisely the status to which the Plunkett co-operative movement had been brought by over thirty years of effort. His theory

was that these gentlemen derived their inspiration as to Irish politics from the whiskey and soda of their London clubs, and he was writing an article to say so. It was Mr. Russell who went to England, in the conscription period, to explain to English Labor that conscription in Ireland was not a military measure by first intention, but was a necessary preliminary to the maintenance of the conscription policy after the war.

There seems to be excellent reason for allowing it to be understood that there is a reservoir of firmness in the country. Lloyd George has indeed condemned the War Office régime in Ireland in the early years of the war, but his condemnation did not prevent its destroying Ireland's reputation as "the one bright spot" nor the relegation of Home Rule to the Greek Kalends. I am informed, by one whom I believe, which is to say by one anybody would believe, a man outside Sinn Féin and the Parliamentary party, that at one of those times when there was reason to think a policy of stark repression was imminent, a decent English general got wind at the War Office of an unauthorized plan which contemplated bloody business in Ireland, that he hurried to Dublin, accused some of the high officials, and on their denial confronted them with their own signatures. He spoiled that plot, but who knows when there will be another, with all the war machines lying about, and with, perhaps, need to distract the attention of England from its own troubles. And how much would it have availed Ireland, if, after the thing then contemplated had been done, there had been official disclaimers of responsibility made with much unction in Parliament? The representative of a London paper called upon an Irish lady a few hours before I did. He told her that England has now become stronger than ever, that she was no longer under obligation to anyone, that she meant to do about Ireland just what she chose, and that interference would not be brooked from any quarter. This gentleman was making a study of Ireland just after the visit of Messrs. Walsh, Dunne and Ryan. I asked her whether anything was likely to be useful to Ireland in presence of this attitude, very general in England, except to oppose to it an equally consistent attitude resting upon a rounded-out conception of Irish character. She answered that she saw nothing else for it.

The opinion of some of the older men among the Nationalists I saw was that the sturdy spirits who stood behind Davitt had the great advantage of being farther removed from the period of their early stress, and were therefore not exposed to the errors of heady youth, and not apt to respond so easily to artful provocation. There is no apprehension on this score among the younger men themselves, who feel that discipline and other rigors must count for something. Still, it is of the nature of political movements carried on as they must be in Ireland against ever threatening force that the ship must sail very close to the wind. I asked a well-known magazine writer, while in Paris, to come to Ireland with

me. He declined, for the reason that he would expect to lose interest in everything else. "All I want to know," he said, "is whether the Irish can go along without fighting. Their best chance to win now is to refuse to be drawn, but as far as I have been able to judge them, that is the hardest thing for them to do." There is one factor he probably does not count upon. The Irish can laugh. If it were not for that they might indeed go mad.

* * *

The Labor movement, as I have said, is making rapid headway. It is boldly, skillfully and honestly led. How honestly, may be inferred from the fact that when the wife of one official accepted a present all the others resigned in protest. It goes without saying that the movement is influenced by the trend of the commotions in the rest of Europe, but as capitalism in its baneful imperialist aspect has not made much progress in Ireland, the task that commands the best efforts of Labor's intelligence is chiefly constructive in character. One of the classes calling for helpful guidance is that which includes great numbers of farm laborers. They are, in a very real sense, the agriculturists, with all the term involves in knowledge of the problems of the soil and the variations of season. The farmer rests a sort of aristocratic claim upon the ownership of land and the raising of cattle. There is all the rigidity of caste in his relation to the laborer. But the laborer is not content, and is going to be still less content, with the estimate of his value this relation inspires.

He is therefore headed straight for co-operative association as the sane and sound way of demonstrating his earning power. Some years ago there was rather strong and general protest against a system of eleven months' leases, under which much land that might be used for tillage is kept under grass for cattle owned by townspeople and others. One who has been in all the movements of the last thirty years predicted in a talk I had with him that the next concentration would be brought to bear against this system, and that a corollary would be the acquisition of lands from whose cultivation the labor agriculturists might make the largest incomes their skill could command. In the cases of many of the other unions, the evident intention is to form groups strong enough to enable the members to take the wage scale out of the realm of haphazard, to catch up, so to say, both as to wages and other conditions now considered elementary, with the practice in other countries. Something of the kind was surely needed; of that the sudden upsurging of hundreds of new unions all over the country is a sufficient proof. The leaders see, however, that the remedies to be sought are not precisely those which might be had in a highly industrialized community, and they are sensible that one function of the labor union in Ireland will be to advance the social education of increasing numbers of young men and women, and that another will be to encourage co-operation in all the ways in which

it can be used to make whatever earnings are available go further than they did. Naturally, with the Bolsheviki bugaboo so present to all minds, there is a good deal of trepidation over the rather purple language the organizers sometimes permit themselves. But speech, while an excellent and often an attractive thing, is not now regarded as so vital a matter as it was once thought to be. Thus, while some of the older clergy stop their ears, some of the younger ones get into personal contact with the Labor men and find they are excellent, well-meaning men, working with truly apostolic spirit for the alleviation of evil conditions which give rise to manifold human ills. The association is exhilarating to a young and zeal-

ous priest, who is sure to make good his own contribution to whatever work is done in common. In the North, within the sphere of Belfast influence, Labor adheres to its English and Scotch affiliations. If it ever looks southward it will find a welcome, but there is not at present any urging. There are many who think, they do not know quite why, that Labor will solve the Ulster difficulty. One gets a glimpse of the possible justice of this view when he hears of instance after instance of southern Irishmen, fugitives from British law, going confidently and securely to the Orangemen of the North for refuge which is never denied. That is another thing the humor of which the Irish always see, the invaders never.

Southern Slav Religious Festival

E. CHRISTITCH

THE Feast of Sts. Cyril and Method, Apostles of the Southern Slavs, was celebrated this year with great pomp and solemnity at Westminster Cathedral in the presence of Cardinal Bourne. For the first time the Catholic character of the new Kingdom—sometimes styled "Greater Serbia," but officially known as The United Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes,—was manifested in England, and, indeed, in Europe by this official act of worship performed in a Catholic temple to thank God for freedom and to intercede for the now independent State. Slavs of both confessions thronged to the celebration, as well as a large concourse of well-wishers, so that the vast space of the Cathedral was almost filled. Not one of the various services combined by Anglican and complacent Orthodox prelates during the war, approached this uniform Sacrifice attended in all sincerity by devout Serbs who realize in their inmost heart the tie of a common faith binding them to their Catholic brethren.

It was felt in responsible Slav circles that at this important moment a service held in a Catholic Church would alone meet the needs of the occasion. The policy of fictitious "reunion" of the Eastern Church with the Established Church of England faded away before the fact of Serbs and Croats joining to call down God's blessing on their newly-formed State and kneeling together for this purpose in the Catholic Cathedral of Westminster. Under the skilled direction of Dr. Terry the orchestra rendered Slav Church music during the celebration of the Sacred Rites and at the beginning and the close, verses of the Serb, Croat and Slovene national anthems were sung by the choir. Telegrams from dignitaries of the new Kingdom and from Croat and Slovene Catholic Bishops had been received early in the morning by his Eminence Cardinal Bourne whose recent tour in the Balkans was the inauguration of the present friendly understanding between English-speaking Catholics and their co-religionists of Southern-Slav nationality. The political advantages of this understanding are not likely

to be overlooked by the Cabinet Ministers in Belgrade.

Perfect stillness marked the rapt attention of the mixed congregation listening to the words of the Rev. Adrian Fortescue who preached on the life and labors of Sts. Cyril and Method, Apostles to the Slavs and venerated as such in both Churches. Father Fortescue, the first living authority on Eastern Church matters, proved indisputably that these Saints went from Constantinople before the schism to spread the Faith among the peoples of Serbia, Slavonia, Moravia and all lands inhabited by Southern Slavs. Impeached by German Bishops, they went to Rome to vindicate their use of the Slav liturgy, thereafter approved, and existent even today among Slavs on the Adriatic littoral. That they were from first to last devoted sons of Rome, who died in Communion with Rome, and were canonized in Rome, was amply set forth by the learned preacher. His words were a revelation to the Orthodox listeners who are accustomed to consider these Saints as patrons and protagonists of the Church to which they themselves belong.

But the innocence of the people, led unconsciously into schism by their spiritual heads, was also explained. Unlike heresies of the West, where millions abandoned their Catholic practices in obedience to rulers, the Christian Slavs of the East clung to their traditional rites and belief, ignorant of the division that was gradually undermining the unity of Christ's Church. In those remote days of belated communication and rare travel, whole communities drifted away from the bark of Peter without realizing it or desiring it. For a long time there was no clear line of demarcation. The schism spread insidiously while the people gathered round their local pastors, nominated as heretofore from Constantinople, whose ambitious Patriarchs alone bear the blame of the deplorable scission. Father Fortescue showed convincingly the harmful results of Greek supremacy in the national churches of the Balkan States, whereas Rome never had any other than a religious interest in the development of the Slav peoples on their own racial lines.

The preacher did not touch on the vexed question of the extension of the Glagolitic, or Old Slav Liturgy which some Slav prelates consider as a precious instrument for the reunion of divided Christendom in Eastern Europe, whereas others would fain see it replaced altogether by the Latin Rite as a means of closer intimacy with Rome. In his writings, however, Father Fortescue advocates not only retention but wide extension of the Glagolite were it only in deference to the valiant Catholics who have adhered to it since the days of their national patrons, Sts. Cyril and Method. He commented on the heroism of the Serbs in the late war and praised the liberal Concordat concluded by the Serbian Government in 1914. A most informative and striking discourse, giving food for thought to the different elements composing the congregation, finished by an allusion to the desirability of reunion which, of course, could only take place under the direction of the Bishop of Rome. Many Anglican divines present followed the words of the distinguished Orientalist savant with deep attention.

We give here the first and the last stanzas of the Serbian national hymn, and also of the Croat national hymn, as well as of the universal Slav hymn sung in Siberia and Dalmatia, in Macedonia and Slovenia, in Bohemia and Poland:

SERBIAN HYMN

God of Justice! Thou who saved us
When in deepest bondage cast,
Hear Thy Serbian children's voices,
Be our help as in the past!
With Thy mighty hand sustain us,
Still our upward pathway trace;
God, our Hope! protect and cherish
Serbian crown and Serbian race!
On our sepulcher of ages
Breaks the resurrection morn,
From the slough of direst slavery
Serbia anew was born.
Through five hundred years of durance
We have knelt before Thy face,
All our kin, O God, deliver!
Thus entreats the Serbian race.

HYMN OF THE CATHOLIC CROATS (Adopted as National Hymn of Yugoslavia)

Jugoslavia! Land we cherish,
Land renowned in song and story,
Thy great name shall never perish,
Jugoslavia! Land of glory!

Beauteous vales and stately mountains,
Nature's queen thy children name thee,
Lov'd in suffering, lov'd in sorrow,
Now a free land we proclaim thee!

Gentle Sava, swift Morava,
Mighty Danube flanked with towers,
Tell it now to all creation—
That your fertile banks are ours.
While the sun shines on our meadows,
While our peaks still echo thunder,
While our dead sleep in their graveyards,
Southern Slavs no more shall sunder!

RALLY OF THE SLAV PEOPLES

Onward, Slavs! The blood of heroes
In our veins is flowing;
With the spirit of our fathers
Still our hearts are glowing.
Live and thrive. O Slavs united!
Flourish through the ages,
While the powers of darkness threaten,
And the tempest rages!
Sweet Slav tongue, the bond of kinsmen,
Blessed gift from Heaven,
Who again shall dare proscribe it
To our race God-given?
Let the whole world frown upon us,
We shall yield to no man.
Under God we stand together
And defy the foe!

To the stirring strains of these anthems the congregation slowly dispersed, bearing away the conviction of a new era in the history of Serbia and of the Catholic Church in the lands she has freed from Turkish and Austrian rule. A few weeks previously the new orientation had been emphasized in Belgrade when the young Prince Regent, many of his Ministers, the Serbian Generalissimo, Marshall Mishitsh, and several other military and State dignitaries attended the Corpus Christi celebration in the Catholic Church. Certainly the collapse of Russia has helped to free Serbia's hand in her arrangements with her Catholic kin formerly subject to Austria; but due credit must be given to her own large-heartedness evidenced in the Concordat signed while Russia was still a great, imperial, world-power. Everything now points to a bright future for the Catholic Church in the Kingdom of the Southern Slavs (Yugoslavia) formed of the united Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

The Real Meaning of Bolshevism

S. A. BALDUS

AFTER having read scores of special articles, some favorable and some unfavorable to European Bolshevism, and much of the foreign correspondence concerning the political situation in Russia and in other countries where soviet government is reported to have been established, I am moved to give my interpretation of some of the kaleidoscopic phenomena, as I view

them, from a distance, it is true, and in perspective, but against the light of the great historic crisis of the past.

Aristotle tells us that there are three political constitutions: kingship, or monarchy, aristocracy, and timocracy which latter "people commonly call constitutional government." "Of these," says Aristotle, "the best is monarchy, and timocracy the worst." Timocracy, he ex-

plains, "recognizes the principle of wealth. . . . From timocracy the transition is to democracy."

Bolshevism evidently is acting on the assumption that the world has never had democracy. Bolshevism, therefore, may be defined as an attempt to overthrow timocracy and to institute democracy. Shall the world be governed as in the past, shall it be made safe for timocracy? Or shall a new political order be established and so make the world safe for democracy?

In Europe, be it remembered, all three of the forms of government of which Aristotle speaks, together with their deflection, were in existence at the beginning of the war: monarchy and its deflection, despotism; aristocracy, and its deflection, oligarchy; and timocracy. Before our entrance into the war there was little or no talk on the part of any of the European Powers about changing the existing forms of government. The destruction of monarchy was distinctly our slogan. We spoke out in no uncertain tones; our language was plain, direct and definite; our declaration is a matter of record. Surely there is none to deny that the United States can claim the distinction of having deposed the Emperors of Germany and of Austria-Hungary. We officially approved the overthrow of the Czar of Russia (see President Wilson's message of April 2, 1917). But Kerensky was shortly replaced by Messrs. Lenine and Trotsky. These two men, together with their associates, are at the present moment, and have been for more than a year, in absolute political control of Russia. The one outstanding and significant fact is that the people of Russia themselves, seem to be in accord with the present Bolshevistic leaders, Messrs. Lenine and Trotsky, whatever the rest of the world may think of them or of soviet government. If a substantial majority of the Russian people were not favorable to their present leaders the latter could not have maintained themselves in power; and above all, they could not have propagated their doctrines in other lands, for soviet governments are established in Munich, and in many other communities, we are told. It is well to keep these things in mind while reading this article.

What, then, is Bolshevism? "The world must be made safe for democracy," declared President Wilson. Bolshevism says in effect: "Very well, Mr. Wilson; we'll help you in your endeavor to make the world safe for democracy, but before democracy can flourish, timocracy—that is, the dominant rule of wealth—must be destroyed." Bolshevism, therefore, is democracy raised to the *n*th power, or reduced to its lowest terms; take your choice. Jefferson's definition of democracy is not so clearly applicable to soviet government as is Carlyle's,—"an impossibility, 'self-government' of a multitude by the multitude."

On one point President Wilson and Messrs. Lenine and Trotsky are agreed, namely that thrones must be toppled over; royalty must become extinct. Now that Nicholas of Russia, William of Germany, Charles of Austria, and also Peter of Serbia, Nicholas of Monte-

negro, Ferdinand of Bulgaria, and Constantine of Greece have been deposed, to say nothing of the Sultan of Turkey, President Wilson may consider that the job is finished, that there is no more to do. But Messrs. Lenine, Trotsky and their disciples, followers and imitators, do not share this view. They seem to think that there is still a line of the royal family living, and protected by government itself. There can be no democracy, say they in effect, until every trace and vestige of all royalty is destroyed. Until the money kings, and steel kings, and coal kings, and meat kings, and sugar kings, and wheat kings, and bread kings, and oil kings, and others are exterminated the world will not be, and cannot be made safe for democracy. That, so far as I am able to see it, seems to me to be their line of thought and reasoning. And I am not quite sure but that they consider the destruction of the economic kings more important and more necessary for democracy than the deposition of merely political kings and emperors.

The thing we call Bolshevism today is nothing new; the name alone is new. It is an old-time fire that has been smoldering for years breaking out into flame once more. Messrs. Lenine, Trotsky and others are not preaching a new gospel; it is an old doctrine, at least several centuries old. It would not require a deep searching of economic and political history to discover its twin brother, or to unearth its prototype. There is not so very great a difference between the Jacobins, Girondists, and Sansculottes, of the French Revolution, and the Bolsheviks of soviet Russia. And if we consider the leaders, Robespierre, Danton and Marat may not be in the same picture, but they are in one gallery with Kerensky, Lenine, Trotsky. In fact a comparative study of the historic phenomena of the French Revolution of 1789 and the Revolution of 1919 reveals many points of similarity. But there is one marked difference. In the French Revolution it was the economic conditions that roused the masses to action, whereas political considerations inspired the leaders. But in the present revolution both the masses and their leaders seem agreed that it is an economic and political revolution combined. Unlike the American Revolution of 1776, which was wholly political, European Bolshevism has plainly a dual character, it is economic and political.

Let no one deceive himself. Bolshevism is a definite economic philosophy, with certain well-defined ideals—I am using the word *ideals* in its present-day loose sense. As a system of government it is necessarily an experiment—as much of an experiment as was the American Republic in 1776, or the French Republic, whose foundations were laid amid the crumbling ruins of the French Empire. So far Bolshevism, as a system of government, has not had time to prove itself either a success or to demonstrate itself a failure. As a matter of fact our own form of government is this very day on trial, and only in the next few months, or years, shall we be able to say positively whether it is a success or a failure.

Since, therefore, Bolshevism is dual in character, it behooves us to inquire into its constituent elements. Let us briefly consider first its economic aspect. Again I say it, Bolshevism is nothing new. Those familiar with politico-economic history will be quick to see in it the fruition of the seeds planted in the first half of the nineteenth century by Proudhon in France, O'Connor in England, and Marx and Engels in Germany. That the writings of these men have been effective, the various attempts to unite the working men of all nations into one international organization would seem to prove. The first meeting of workmen of all nations was held in London, September 28, 1864.

The thing we call Bolshevism today may be called the Marxian Socialistic program, made possible by the discontent of the masses. It is a combination of Socialism and Chartism. The former is probably better understood by the average man, than the latter. And yet Chartism is, so to speak, at the very root of Bolshevism. Carlyle defined Chartism as

The bitter discontent grown fierce and mad, the wrong condition, therefore, or the wrong disposition, of the working classes. . . . It is a new name for a thing which has had many names, which will yet have many. The matter of Chartism is weighty, deep-rooted, far-extending; did not begin yesterday; will by no means end this day or tomorrow. . . . What means this bitter discontent of the working classes? Whence comes it, whither goes it? Above all, at what price, on what terms, will it probably consent to depart from us and die into rest? These are questions. To say that it is mad, incendiary, nefarious, is no answer.

In the days of which Carlyle wrote Chartism was inchoate Bolshevism, that is, it was unorganized, sporadic and endemic; today it is organized, indigenous, ubiquitous and epidemic. No! these are not merely big-sounding, meaningless words dug out of the dictionary for the purpose of pedantic pyrotechnic display; they are used here because in no other terms, in no simpler words, can I give the diagnosis of this new disease from which the world has begun to suffer. In fact it is not so much a disease as it is a symptom, and it behooves us, if we are wise, to try to determine what is the root of this latest manifestation and what is the cure.

Personally I have no patience with the unwisdom of the all-too-apparent attempt that is being made on the part of certain nations, parties and interests, to delude the public into believing that the thing we call Bolshevism is something that it is not. We do not rock babies to sleep when the house is on fire. Many centuries ago Nero fiddled while Rome burned. But this year 1919, is no time for jazz-band distraction! Let us honestly try to understand the subject; to grapple with it fearlessly; to deal with it intelligently.

There are at least two men in the world who know what Bolshevism really is; they are Woodrow Wilson and Lloyd George; and the fact that they fully comprehend the significance of the phenomenon explains many things which otherwise would be inexplicable. Lloyd

George fears only one master in Great Britain, organized labor. Why do you suppose President Wilson declared twice within recent months that "the peoples are in the saddle?" Read his message of recent date to Congress and you will find that it deals principally with suggestions for Federal labor legislation. I was not surprised when today (June 9) I read in one of the Chicago papers that portion of the Peace Treaty referring to "Labor." I expected it, and it proved my theory of an endeavor on the part of governments not only to conciliate and placate, but to control organized labor. The one force of which all governments are standing in dread today is organized labor; they realize its tremendous power, and are cognizant of its overwhelming force. Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson are not deluding themselves. With their glasses on they have deciphered the writing on the wall.

While the Peace delegates were sitting in Versailles, International Labor Socialists held a conference in Berne. The daily press gave practically no news concerning the Berne Conference, but certain special writers managed, somehow, to send over articles which were illuminating to the student of International questions. Of the two conferences the one at Berne was by far the more significant. From the Berne reports it is clear that the Peace Treaty is not in conformity with the views of the international labor group. Since the publication of the summary of the Treaty, labor bodies—whether you call them Syndicalists, Socialists, or by some other name matters little—have voiced their protest against the severe terms, none more emphatically than those of England and France.

Richard Washburn Child, in an article in *Collier's*, May 31, 1919, states that a few days after the House of Commons in England had signed a communication to Lloyd George practically demanding that Germany be billed "with the whole cost of the war," the labor union parade marched "to Hyde Park with banners demanding that the blockade of Germany should be lifted at once." And in Italy another procession "carrying furled their red flags, with whom marched an Italian agitator who said that if the Peace Conference took too much loot for the capitalists of the world there would be mobs taking control of Milan and Rome."

But most significant, and altogether more alarming, are the manifestations in other directions—labor strikes and demonstrations. The workmen's and soldiers' associations that are already formed will probably complete their programs only after the armies are demobilized. It is disturbing to contemplate that in several of the armies and navies of Europe there have been incidents of a character not entirely reassuring.

With regard to the political aspect of Bolshevism it is my opinion that as a system of government Bolshevism is self-destructive and will not endure, either in Russia or in any other land where it seems to have gained a foothold politically. But while I think soviet govern-

ment will not endure, political Bolshevism will; and unless present signs are altogether misleading, it will gather strength and a greater momentum, during the years, or months, of peace to come. Out of the thing we call Bolshevism today, will grow a new attitude of the people toward governments. Bolshevism will not be the government itself, but it will rule the governments of the earth. The people, organized and powerful, will dictate, if not policies of government, then the decisions of statesmen-ministers and rulers.

"The peoples of the world are awake," said President Wilson in a recent speech, "and the peoples of the world are in the saddle. Private counsels of statesmen cannot now, and cannot hereafter, determine the destinies of nations." Of the many sayings of our President, this is by far his wisest and most profound utterance. It stamps him as a prophet of vision and a statesman of keenest insight. I can only hope that the opinions of the people and of statesmen will always coincide in all important matters, that there will be no clash between them in any critical hour. I prefer to exempt for the present the United States from Mr. Wilson's category of "peoples," but frankly, as regards the European peoples, I scent disaster. The tremendous power their ministers and rulers have exercised in the past will be circumscribed henceforth by the more tremendous power of the people themselves. Hereafter when one government declares war against another nation the consent of the people will be necessary, and that consent, if I am reading the situation aright, is as likely to be withheld as given. Bolshevism will lift up its head! Bolshevism probably under a new name—whether Internationalism, Brotherhood of Man, or "the One Big Union," I will not pretend to say—will raise up its hand and cry out "stop!" "Why," its members will ask, "why shall we kill our brothers in Russia, or Italy or France? Why shall we reduce ourselves and families to beggary and starvation? Why condemn to misery and wretchedness the wives and children of our brother-workmen living in another State? And who profits by war? Not we! Who pays the full bill? Why we do; in life, in blood and in treasure. It is for us to say whether we will fight this war or not!"

And when governments talk of blockades to be laid against this nation and that, or of economic boycotts, both of which mean hunger and suffering for millions of women and children of workingmen, the nations using the blockade or launching the boycott will be called to terms, not by the peoples to be blockaded and boycotted, but by the people of the blockading nation.

All I have written here is in comment only on the first act of the revolutionary drama that is being played in Europe today, and on which the curtain is about to descend. There are several other acts, equally as interesting, yet to be played. What will the final climax be? Politically speaking the world is in travail. Will it bring forth a ridiculous mouse or a dragon? Who knows?

Famine in India

HAROLD HALL

IN the story of world-unrest that flashes from the pages of the press little space is given to India. Yet mutterings have come from out of the East in spite of censorship and these same mutterings bode ill for the peace of the world. India has registered her protest against misgovernment in the unmistakable language of revolt and she speaks with the voice of 300,000,000. You cannot silence that cry with the machine gun or the cordon of steel. Russia has proved that and so has Ireland and for that matter so did the Colonies in '76. The West has looked at India from afar, and for the most part with a keen eye for Western interests. Yet even from the selfish standpoint of Western interests present-day India presents a terrifying sight. Early this year Mr. R. H. Hume of the American Board in Bombay was quoted by the *New York Evening Post* to the effect that "war, famine and pestilence are combining to make the present season in India the most serious and distressing in a hundred years. The war has depleted India's stock of grain and doubled and trebled the prices of life-necessities. Into this distress has come influenza in a deadly pneumonic form, laying low hundreds of thousands, and carrying off thousands of bread winners." On April 26 the *New York Times* carried a London cable-dispatch declaring: "Almost 5,000,000 persons have died in British India from Spanish influenza. . . . The hospitals were so choked it was impossible to remove the dead quickly enough to make room for the dying. Streets and lanes were littered with the dead and dying. Burning ghats and burial grounds were literally piled with corpses." And on the first of May in the *New York Evening Telegram* confirmation was given from London of famine conditions in India, "a fact to which scarcely any publicity has been accorded owing to the world's preoccupation with the Peace Conference."

The British Government has been strangely silent on the Indian famine. Perhaps for the very simple reason that famine should not be there where resources are abundant. India produces more foodstuffs than she can consume, she has the richest rice crop in the world, and in wheat output she is second to the United States and Russia. Her famine history calls for an explanation in these days when we are deliberating on a League of Nations, and giving mandates to great nations that are to benefit and not exploit the smaller and weaker States. How has England acquitted herself of her Eastern charge, not according to Kipling's fancy but according to facts and figures? Up to this year the famine record of 1899-1900 was one of the worst, and yet in that year grain worth \$60,332,445 was exported by the ruling power. Anent the present strange situation in a country that should be a land of plenty, the *London Times* of April 25 quoted its Bombay correspondent as saying:

India having been swept bare of foodstuffs to meet the exigencies of the war, the people feel that the Home Government is lukewarm in releasing supplies from outside, and resent particularly the fact that the shipping controller is maintaining high freight on fat and rice from Burma.

British rule in India is well described by Sir William Digby. In "Prosperous British India" he gives the following famine figures: "From 1769 to 1800 there were seven famines, while in the nineteenth century there were thirty-one famines with about thirty-three million deaths as a consequence." This death-roll is instructive in terms of colonial rule, especially when we remember that in all the wars of the nineteenth century the death-list reached only about 5,000,000, and in the World-War just ended 7,000,000. The death-record in India from famine, plague and pestilence during the same period has been 10,000,000. It would appear that the people of India might rightly be classed among those colonies whose peoples, as the President told the Senate in speaking of another nation's colonies, "had not been governed; they had been exploited merely, without thought of the interest or even the ordinary human rights of their inhabitants." And most applicable too is the President's indictment of colonial misrule, not merely to the shattered Austrian-Hungarian Empire, but to the present-day India, broken and starving: "It never had any real unity. It had been held together only by pitiless inhuman force." An Indian civil service offering a good career to the Briton, and an Indian army safeguarding his investments while the native population died by the millions: surely the one-time German colonies offer no sadder picture.

Of course there is much ado about crowded population, ignorance, and shiftlessness. Yet famine is the fact in a land that is a natural granary, with a population whose density per square miles is but 211, while Belgium's is 589, Holland's 454, Japan's 317, China's 266, Italy's 293.47. Nor is the birth-rate so high that it can be blamed for food scarcity. For in China the birth-rate is 50 per thousand, in Russia 49, in Serbia 41, in Hungary 40, in Bulgaria 39 in Germany 36, while in Mexico, Chile and India it is 36. Nor can the failure of rain be the cause of famine, as India has one of the heaviest rain-falls in the world. Proper irrigation works would remedy the unequal rain-fall distribution. Any amount of money is used by the conquering white man for strategic railroads, villas, and comfortable houses, while the native population starves. Why the latest British-Indian budget provides \$200,000,000 for military purposes out of a total appropriation of \$400,000,000.

Basanta Koomer Roy, put his finger on the sore spot when he declared that the cause of India's famine is "England's economic hooliganism." Roy is a native of the land and an American-university graduate. He goes right to the heart of the difficulty when he says that by "barbarous laws, savagely executed as in Ireland the British have ruined our arts, and crafts and industries for the benefit of the English manufacturer and investor."

The outwitted artisan was forced to the farm, and there the system of rack-rents took sixty per cent of the fruit of labor in rents. In British India the Government is the supreme landlord, the farmer getting the land on a twenty-year lease. At the expiration of the lease the rent is raised, thereby affecting 80 per cent of the population, for such is the farmer-proportion today. In eleven years, that is from 1879 to 1890 in the Bombay Presidency alone, there were sold for revenue the occupancy rights of nearly 2,000,000 acres of land held by 840,713 defaulters. Of all those acres 1,174,143 had to be bought in by the Government. That is nearly sixty per cent of the land supposedly assessed equitably could not find purchasers.

As in Ireland so in India it has been the story of "tax-created poverty, and poverty-created famine," under British misrule. As a natural consequence in these days when a war has been fought to make the world a safe place to live in, to enable peoples to "lead their own lives, determine their own institutions as against the powers of force and selfish aggression," the peoples of India and of Ireland have risen against the common tyrant, still wielding the sword of conquest while prating of the freedom of small nations. Ireland's cry has rung round the world. India has caught that cry of outraged justice and she will re-echo it with the terrible voice of 300,000,000. Will the West hear the East before it is too late?

Hamlet and the Bible

F. J. TALBOT, S. J.

"An expurgated edition," he exclaimed, handing me a khaki-bound copy of the New Testament. It was the Douai Version, the size of a soldier's pocket, and had been illustrated by his blue-penciled crosses.

"Warranted to be harmless to soldier and sailor?" I asked, fingering the mutilated pages.

"Quite so. I have censored it according to the Higher Criticism, and so have omitted the supernatural element, miracles and that sort of thing."

"You have rejected the Nativity," I questioned.

"A mere myth, an apparent plagiarism from the Buddhist legends."

"The Resurrection and the Rock of Peter passage are also crossed out," I objected.

"There has been so much quibbling about the Primacy, that we have decided the passage to be an interpolation," he replied blandly. "As for the Resurrection, the Evangelists have bungled that frightfully."

He was a Higher Critic of the Berlin-Harnack type, with an opaque vision for any reality outside of his own little head.

"You have been reading Hamlet?" I took the play from the table. "I suppose you are applying your tests to this, too."

"No, that is only light reading, a little relaxation, you know. The play is substantially unchanged."

"Your acceptance of it is most gracious. But the scholars of Berlin would throw the play into a linden tree, and smugly deny that Hamlet or the immortal William ever existed."

"They are only Higher Critics of a sort," he distinguished.

"While your sort," I urged, "would distort it by fantastic interpretation." He smiled at my orthodoxy. "But the real meaning of Hamlet has never been discovered by its million

critics," I continued, with the bravado of a real Higher Critic groping for an interpretation. "Hamlet is not a play. It is an allegory, a satire, a palimpsest that reveals the heart of Shakespeare, when the apparent words are rubbed away."

"Quite interesting from the psychological view-point," he remarked ambiguously.

I took it that he was not personal, but referred to my interpretation, and continued with the ardor of a modern critic. "In 1603, you remember, Elizabeth lay dying. The political sky was clouded, the succession was in doubt, the economic world was in chaos, anarchy was seething, and religion was no longer a matter of free will. It was the year that Shakespeare began to write his four great tragedies; he was stepping into a period of personal sorrow and melancholy, whose source has troubled critics. Shakespeare was a man of keen insight and deep understanding, he had plunged into the underworld and gossiped with the rulers, all England lay plain before him, and his knowledge bred heart-burnings. 'The time is out of joint,' is his criticism in Hamlet. All England 'is an unweeded garden,'"

That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature
Possess it merely.

He had weighed his contemporary age and had found it wanting; he had burst the bubble of Elizabeth's reign, and was dejected. If he loosed his tongue, he would have lost his head, so he wrote Hamlet, the cleverest and most subtle of allegories, the most bitter condemnation of the Reformed England of Elizabeth."

I paused, and his smile was quizzical.

"Hamlet is the story of man in two successive periods of history. The Dane, noble and princely and happy while his father lived, is suddenly paralyzed by stupendous changes. The old king is poisoned, the old order dies, and Claudius mounts the throne. The dreamer and idealist, faced with his first glimpse of concrete evil, falls into black-broodings and melancholy. Hamlet is Mankind, the old King is the Middle Ages, and Claudius is the Reformation. The light of these two ages plays upon Mankind; in the earlier, he sported in the sunshine of God's favor, and was working out a glorious civilization. This period came to a tragic end by treachery and violence and murder. In the new reign, Mankind, like Hamlet, became perplexed and troubled; he doubted and questioned and pondered thoughts unholy, 'a thousand, thousand slimy things.' The old age was to this new, as 'Hyperion to a satyr.'"

"What of the Queen," the Higher Critic suggested, "and the Ghost and the other characters? Have you place for them also?"

"The State is a woman, and so Shakespeare has represented it by the Queen. With the old king, she had been a regal queen and a lawful wife. She survived the changes, but by a hasty and unnatural marriage, united herself with the usurper. Her act loosed the bonds of affection that united her and her son, and he scorches her with burning words. It was thus the State persisted through the dynamic changes and tumult of the Reformation period, but her fairness had faded. While she was united in lawful bonds with the Middle Ages, she received filial respect and love from Mankind. In the Reformation, the State had deteriorated into a mistress; the principles of moral restraint and respect for constituted authority were snapped, and Mankind, no more than Hamlet, could pay honor to the power that had corrupted itself. External obedience he showed, but his heart rankled and rebelled within him."

"Thus Shakespeare represents the perplexity of his age by the troubled soul of Hamlet. Life was a mystery of misery to him—and then a vision of horror. On the cold, gray stones of the tower, 'in the dead vast and middle of the night,' the ghost of the old king startles the shivering sentinels and Hamlet. It speaks the dreadful revelation of the crime, it marks the con-

trast between the king that was a father and the usurper. Night is the time for ghosts and visions and memories. It must have been on one such midnight that Shakespeare had his vision. He had ransacked the ancient lore and history of the Middle Ages in his search for plots; he had well calculated the showy world of reality in which he lived. The ghost of the murdered king was his way of representing the memory and vision of the Middle Ages and how its glory was poisoned by the Reformation. Shakespeare was haunted by its master-piece cathedrals, the art of Michael Angelo, the intellectualism of Aquinas, the sublimity of Dante, the economic balance of the guild system, the clear-eyed certainty about morality and religion and God. In his own world, cathedrals were ransacked not built, art was strangled in its inspiration, no literature save his own was in the making, the economic order was tottering, intellectualism had degenerated into disbelief and denunciation, morality was muddled and faith in God all but destroyed. Therefore, Shakespeare depicts Mankind in the age of Elizabeth as a mad and distracted Hamlet, helpless in the face of its evils." He interrupted me, "But your facts are distorted and hardly warrant your 'therefore.'"

"Remember this is your Higher Criticism," I retorted. "My theory must be true, despite history. Your modern criticism, you know, first strikes on its conclusion and then marshals its facts. Whether he did or not, Shakespeare must have intended this interpretation of the play. In the olden days, there was a maid whom Hamlet loved and courted. She was a shy, young flower whom Shakespeare called Ophelia, but meant Conscience. In the Middle Ages conscience was a restraining power, a small voice in a big world; but Mankind loved and respected her as Hamlet did Ophelia. In the new reign of usurpation and murder, there was no room for conscience. 'Get thee to a nunnery,' Hamlet tells her. But the Reformation had destroyed the convents and Ophelia, the only fragrance in this blood-reeking tragedy, rejected, dies a victim of man's infidelity. The father that should have guarded her had abandoned her. In the earlier age, the chancellors of the kingdom were churchmen, who had nourished the morality of man; in the new age, Polonius, who typifies Lord Burleigh, had become a mere tool of the State."

The action hurries along. Humanity is as lethargic as Hamlet to deeds of violence. Bolshevism is an acquired habit, and so Shakespeare and the sincere men of his age are withheld from revolt by that mysterious will-paralysis which critics find in Hamlet. Claudius and the Queen try to woo the Prince by soft words, "Think of us as a father." This is the supreme egotism of Protestantism; after sundering by its doctrine of specious liberty the parental bonds that should unite subject and ruler, it still demands obedience. With unconscious irony, it tells man "to seek thy noble father in the dust," the very place to which the Reformation has dragged the glory of the Middle Ages. The King offers substitutes for the old peace and joy. The players are suborned to minister to Hamlet's pleasure; in the same way, Elizabeth tried to distract honest minds by vain show and splendor, from the deeper significance of life. Material prosperity is the next lure, and for Shakespeare, England meant materialism and financial madness. "Send him to England" is therefore the counsel he puts into the mouth of the king. "Immerse him in commerce and world conquest, and he will surely forget the glory of the past." But Hamlet and Mankind refused to be entirely hoodwinked, and the result was a death warrant. Thereafter, for Hamlet, England meant death. Shakespeare, as he finished the play, looked out on Tyburn Hill. The blood of the martyrs was calling to heaven; they were slaughtered because they had seen the ghost of the Middle Ages."

"Elizabeth lay dying, with none to succeed her. In Shakespeare's mind, an epoch lay dying and anarchy seemed imminent. Thus he represents the universal ruin and death of all the char-

acters in the last scene. Suddenly there is a martial note, and Fortinbras, the Prince from the North, bursts upon the stage in all the vigor and freshness of youth. Whom else could Shakespeare have meant by this Prince from the North, except the man who would restore the old religion, and around whom the aroma of the Middle Ages clung, the hope of the time to come, James of Scotland? Shakespeare was, however, better as critic of the present, than a prophet of the future."

The modern critic tried to piece it together. "You have not interpreted Horatio and Laertes and the Gravediggers," he said, after a pause.

"They are interpolations, the additions of later ages. Like miracles and the Resurrection in your mutilated Bible, they do not fit in very well with my theory, and therefore I have discarded them."

"But your theory is based on assumptions; it distorts history and logic."

"You Higher Critics have assumed that liberty."

"Do you imply that we higher critics of the Bible are untruthful and forgers?"

"Not exactly, but you seem to miss truth by a margin of a mile or so."

"And you claim that the Higher Criticism is false?"

"It is a black lie."

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words

Miracles at Ste. Anne de Beaupré

To the Editor of AMERICA:

On my return to the Catholic Summer School at Cliff Haven, N. Y., from a pilgrimage to Ste. Anne de Beaupré, where I was singularly privileged to witness four "*supra naturam*" miracles, many persons who heard me relate my experiences suggested that I correspond with you and offer in writing those experiences for the interests of your readers.

Ste. Anne de Beaupré is a typical French-Canadian village peacefully resting on the western bank of the St. Lawrence River twenty-one miles north of Quebec. Outside of its quaint old-fashioned dwellings there is nothing of interest save the Cathedral which is eminently the center of attraction. It is massive and elegantly beautiful. On entering its portals one is immediately attracted by the multitude of crutches, supports, canes and numerous other aids to infirmity discarded and left behind by those who had been cured. Each of these articles is tagged with a card bearing the name of the one who was cured, together with their condition before and after the miracle took place. As you advance down the middle aisle the statue of Ste. Anne is observed resting on a pedestal in an elevated position. The famous relic is mounted on a gold altar and is ever the nucleus of untiring devotion.

The feast of Ste. Anne is July 26. On this day pilgrimages from all parts of the world arrive, and participate in the celebration. It was on this day that I witnessed the miracles which I will try to relate as I personally observed them. During the morning no miracles had taken place. High Mass was celebrated by the Bishop of Quebec, followed by the osculation of the relic. At twelve, all left the Cathedral except the infirm or afflicted who remained in undivided prayer. Being of a somewhat curious temperament I wandered back to a front pew, not so much to pray, as to be on hand should a miracle occur. I had unintentionally taken my seat beside a man bereft of sight, whose fervor at prayer caught my attention forthwith. He continued praying with unceasing zeal for many minutes. Of a sudden, without any commotion, he elevated his head, raised his hands to his eyes and rubbed them till they finally opened. He saw. His eyes after twenty-eight years of stone-blindness had regained vision. Imagine the degree of wonderment that held me during this

miraculous production. Not half an hour passed before I beheld the second miracle. A young girl in the heyday of life presented herself before the statue afflicted with a deformed hip. From childhood she had used a crutch and as she afterwards told, the day when she walked was so long back that she could not remember. On kissing the relic, her hip lowered, and she walked down the aisle totally unaided.

The next two miracles occurred within five minutes of each other. All had left the church to march in the procession of the Blessed Sacrament which was carried in full view about the grounds of the Cathedral, terminating at the front steps where Benediction was given. It was at the close of Benediction that a lady in direct juxtaposition to me bade me hold her crutches while she walked. I offered her assistance, which was politely though strongly declined. For sixteen years she had never walked, on account of a severe attack of acute rheumatism which had left her deprived of the use of her limbs. She was glad to answer any questions and even gave me her name and address. As I said before, I am curious by nature and I took advantage of her good-will to ask many questions. While in the process of interrogation I was told that when the miracle took place, no sensation was felt. She assured me that all she felt was a twitching of the muscles that started to move and fall into place accompanied by an inclination to walk.

I was deeply moved and possibly never again will such tense moments be mine. It is a shock, a severe shock to be standing beside a cripple who suddenly throws aside crutches, refuses all help and walks without fear or hesitation. As I slowly recovered from this shock I was similarly bewildered to see a young man rise from his wheeling-chair and begin to walk. I was told that he was twenty-five years old and had lost the use of both legs through hardening of the muscles. He moved with some difficulty though without pain.

A few more miracles took place that day, which were told me afterwards, of these I know absolutely nothing. What I have related above I saw with my own eyes, and heard from the very mouths of the recipients of the miracles. Why it was that out of the hundreds of people that were present I should happen to be so centrally located in the miracle zone, transcends my knowledge and imagination, but the fact is that there I was. As I left Beaupré that night, I had but one thought in my mind and that was an imaginary conglomeration of all the atheists and agnostics throughout the world on a pilgrimage to Ste. Anne de Beaupré.

Haverford, Pa.

ARTHUR C. HIRST.

An Open Letter to Senator Smith

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The following open letter I thought might prove interesting to your readers:

Dear Senator:

I'm disconsolate, inconsolable, and everything. And it's your fault. Here I am, been going to school for years, public schools, too, Senator, sitting at the feet of learned professors and doctors, drinking deeply of the fountains of knowledge, gathering up the precious intellectual fluid that showered about me and all the time living in sweet hopes of an enlightened existence. And then, Senator, you pricked the bubble of my visions, with a cruel blow you shattered foundations I thought impregnable, nothing can save me from mental Bolshevism. Today, July 29, in the *Times*, you spoke of the ignorance of the "dark ages." Do you spell them with capitals, too? What made them dark, Senator, did they need an intellectual window-washing, like certain Georgia Democrats, or were they just "plain stupid"? I shall never forgive you for my wasted years: all I thought was knowledge must be unlearned. Why did you not let me live on in blissful ignorance? And Prohibition has deprived me of possible solace.

Senator, I once thought we owed something to the dark ages, our ancestry, at least. Or are you an evolutionist, denying to the dark ages even the pitiful honor of con-

tributing to your family "tree"? I could make a very disagreeable play on that word "tree," you know, monkeys, and things? By the way, Senator, aren't there many persons in Georgia whose ancestors came from Africa?

Do you know, I used to think that the dark ages contributed even more than just posterity to our civilization. Even those dear public schools that you cherish so fondly, those benighted educational orphans that you wish to fold in the warmth of Federal embrace, even they, I thought, owed their grammar, and their mathematics, and their geography, and their classics to the ignorance of the dark ages. And, Senator, do you use a Bible, or just carry it to "services" and read the *Menace* behind it while the preacher discourses on "The Exigency of Static Dynamics"? In my ignorance, I have attributed even the preservation of the Bible to the zeal and indomitable energy of those dwellers in "darkness." Be careful, Senator, and do not contribute any of your hard-earned pennies to the fund for rebuilding shattered cathedrals in Europe. It were far better, for you, to let those monumental evidences of dark-age ignorance mingle with the dust of their inspired builders.

Are you aware that you also spoke of the clergy as "the leaders of thought in the dark ages"? Honest, you did—just think of it—leaders of thought in the dark ages. Now, don't be angry with me for finding fault. Since you have shattered my dreams I come to you as a child (of a public school, too), eager and curious. Please, Mr. Smith, how could there be leaders of thought in the dark ages? Tell me, don't be selfish and keep this secret to yourself.

Dear Senator, that fretful offspring of yours, the Smith-Towner bill, must be making you walk the floor o' nights, for sense has lost its reason. You say: "The charge that this bill would banish God from every school is without the slightest foundation." You are more accurate than you know. The bill would not banish God from the public schools. Long, long ago that was accomplished. It fell to my lot to attend public elementary schools and public high schools, and public colleges, in New York City,—and what could be more public than a New York City public school? And it has fallen to my lot to be a teacher in the public schools which have suddenly become the object of your unaccountable passion, and do you know, Senator, that never in text-book or story-book have I seen honor paid or reverence taught to the name of God. I have read of fairies, and elves, of dwarfs and giants, of bugbears and bugaboos, of all the host of imaginative nonsense that fills our text-books, but nothing of God. The name of God is seldom mentioned in the classrooms by teachers or principals, it is regarded as a disagreeable subject, something to be avoided at all costs, and if ever the necessity of mentioning God should arise the reference is made guardedly and with half apology, as if in fear of giving offense, or else disguised under the vague terms "nature," or "force." Washington and Lincoln, Aristotle and Caesar, all are studied and admired,—and I love to teach children to admire them, and all the worthy men to whom we owe some part of our civilization. But suppose I taught the beauty and significance of the life of Christ, not even as the superior of these men but merely as an equal, Mr. Smith, what odds would you give me on the tenure of my office? I should be stopped in the first round with an official right uppercut, while the sopping sponge of "public" opinion came hurtling through the air.

Just think, too, you spoke of "the ignorance of the masses" in the dark ages. Now, dear friend and fellow-Democrat,—you see I am even a Democrat,—charity should begin back on the old homestead. Senator, cover this while you are reading it and burn it when you have finished, for I am going to let pussy out of the sack. There are to-day in the state of Georgia about 2,593,717 people who are native-born, people to whom your State owes an opportunity denied by no civilized community, an opportunity to secure a modest education at the cost of the State. But of the number mentioned, 388,842 persons are illiterate. In other words, fifteen per cent of the native-born population of Georgia is illiterate. Of the native-born population of New York State less than four-fifths of one per cent is illiterate. Now, "fess up," Senator. You know the object of your bill is to make New York State and all other States pay for the education that Georgia has failed to provide for her children. Don't you think you cut a sorry figure begging in the United States Senate for the educational facilities that other States have themselves granted to their children? Go home quickly, Senator, and begin that belated "reconstruction" that should long ago have been completed.

Our State is satisfied with what it has accomplished in its schools. We are even willing to extend a helping hand to you in your problems, but we don't want to be made do it. That would not be charity and brotherly love, it would be imposition.

A sincere well-wisher,

OWEN DAVIN.

Columbia University Summer School, N. Y.

I fear I have been very diffuse, but Senator Smith is responsible for it.

New York.

O. D.

Catholics and the Negro Question

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I read with pleasure your editorial "Catholics and the Negro Question," in AMERICA for July 19. It seems to me that some Catholics are guilty of something worse than "scandalous" indifference in their attitude towards their colored neighbor. They are not satisfied with indifference, but seem to assume that the Church of God was established for their own kith and kin only and that it was never intended as a haven of salvation for those of a darker color than their own. Thus they erect the only real barrier which is apt to keep the negro without the pale of the true Faith. They not only fail in the law of universal charity, but in that common-sense and tact which even the I. W. W. is shrewd enough to use in enlisting adherents to its cause. In short, they would even draw the color line within the house of God.

Not long ago I met an old negro, an ex-slave, to whom I spoke of the Catholic Church. He seemed ready to listen and so I continued visiting him. I noticed that when I spoke to him, he observed me keenly as though trying to form a correct estimate of my character. At the same time there seemed to be something plainly working in his mind. Finally, one day, he told me to go to ——— Catholic Church, two or three miles distant from the shanty in which he lived, and look up the records, and I would find that he and his whole family had been baptized some twenty years ago. I made the investigations and found that it was as he had said. So the next time I saw him I asked him why he had stopped going to church. He told me that after their Baptism he and his family had not been going to Mass for many weeks, when one Sunday after Mass a member of the congregation assailed him with the question: "What are you coming here for, you dirty black dog?" "That was nigh twenty years ago," he said, "and I and my family have not been to church since then."

I met a Catholic colored woman who had not been to church for some twelve years. When I asked her why, she told me that the trustees of the parish had ordered her to sit always in a back seat by the door. She said that the priest had tried to console her, but that he himself had seemed to be afraid of the trustees. The day was already fixed for the Baptism of another old negro of my acquaintance, but he was so insulted by a Catholic the very day before the ceremony was to have taken place that he refused to be baptized. A colored woman told me that she had more than once seen white ladies, who had happened to get in the same pew with her, return from the communion-rail and then, before kneeling to make their thanksgiving, sneeringly gather up their dresses to avoid contamination. Others again, and I have seen it myself, complain of the impolite practice of staring on the part of their white fellow-worshippers.

These incidents did not occur in Southern States and, moreover, were in diverse parts of the country. Their number could be multiplied. It seems to me that the first great assistance that should be given to the heroic priests and Sisters who are laboring for the conversion of the negro, is to train white Catholics a little better in common politeness if not in the fundamental maxim of Christianity, "Love thy neighbor."

Hillyard, Wash.

W. M. M.

A M E R I C A

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Washington and Chicago

TWO American cities very proud of their Americanism have been disgraced by race riots. Accounts differ as to the origin of the rioting, but death lists leave no room for doubt about the violence that has prevailed. Rioting in any form is an expression of contempt for law. It should be firmly put down and those guilty should be made to pay the penalty, whether they belong to the white or to the colored race.

An outbreak in two cities that are far apart is an indication that the rioting did not merely happen. More than chance led up to these scenes of lawlessness. They may have been the result of radical propaganda that the parlor Socialists and Bolsheviki have encouraged. They may have been an indication of a spirit of discontent that is smouldering in a certain class of the population. They are certain signs of a sore spot in the body politic. The State has not fulfilled its duty in suppressing disorder. Moreover, it has the added duty of remedying the cause of disorder. If under the name of free speech radical Socialism is given full swing from street corners and in the pages of the press, then fire and sword, the consecrated weapons of this particular kind of Socialism, will make their message felt to the undoing of the commonwealth. Radical Socialism talks liberty and acts license. Witness Soviet Russia. One of her leading spirits talked a while ago from the street corners of an American city. His passport to Russia was secured at the instance of an American Socialist. Ruined Russia is his triumph.

When freedom of speech means license to attack the fundamentals of law and order then all hope of making a world or a nation safe for democracy is gone. The autocracy of mob rule is more terrible than any we can visualize in Tsar or Kaiser. Yet radical Socialism means mob rule, and it has been shouted from the street corners of American cities not merely yesterday, but for a good many yesterdays. Its principles have been scattered broadcast in pamphlet and paper and magazine article. There have been Fabian societies and so-called smart people who have encouraged it among the ignorant and the ill-instructed under the guise of liberalism and education. It is not long since the execution of Ferrer was

made the occasion of establishing schools where loyalty to country was taboo and reverence for law was ridiculed. Exactly ten years ago one of our popular magazines carried a series of articles that proved from notes taken in the classrooms of some of our leading universities that the doctrines taught by advanced professors were subversive of American principles of ordered freedom. Law and the Constitution were gently but firmly cast into the discard.

The mob spirit is not peculiar to any race. Its growth in America, marked by lynchings and riots, shows that lawlessness is white as well as black. It does not grow over night. Its seeds are planted in the young mind at school or in university hall or in the peoples' university, the public press. Chicago and Washington merely furnished the occasions for its manifestation.

Profiteers and the People

AT last the scandalous process by which tradesmen are enabled to charge exorbitant prices for the necessities of life has been forced on the attention of the President. What he will do about this particularly odious form of theft; indeed, what he can do to correct the evil is a subject of vague conjecture. Apparently the trusts which control the willing and unwilling tradesmen have come to stay. For years politicians and politics, the law, the courts and, often, the pulpits were all in favor of the former kind of thievery. As a consequence, the devil that might have been strangled at its birth has become a devil strong enough to resist both State and national governments, and the poor are the victims.

An irritating feature of this present problem is that by the aid of a venal, subsidized press, the money-lords played diligently at supra-patriotism, and the blood of our soldiers returned to the Shylocks in good, ringing, gold pieces.

What can be done to remedy this evil? Dissolve the trusts? Impossible; they are greater than the country; and could, if they wished, plunge it into financial ruin. Not so many years since one financier was angered at a contemplated action of the national Government and got his revenge by causing a financial panic. If one man can work such havoc, what could not a combination of thirty unscrupulous, remorseless vampires do? The outlook is too black for contemplation.

What then shall be done with the trusts? Restrain them by law? For years they have made laws, unmade laws, broken laws, evaded laws, turned laws to their profit until at last they have become a law unto themselves. And there the case rests.

The trusts control the products of the country, the poor are scarcely able to live, and the President of the United States is considering what action should be taken. The outcome will be awaited with interest, but by the unsophisticated only. Everybody else knows now what the result will be.

But some day the unsophisticated will become wise; then a united and indignant people will solve the problem, for just there the solution lies, in an intelligent people who know their rights and will insist that verbiage give way to the action which they, the real rulers of the country, will dictate for their own benefit. And if this action is revolution, which may God avert, the responsibility will rest on the shoulders of a small group of short-sighted, selfish men who have turned their brothers into machines for the product of wealth and yet more wealth, to the benefit of the few and the detriment of the many.

"Can Ireland Stand Alone?"

"CAN Ireland stand alone? Is not her dependence on England so great that complete separation would mean the commercial and industrial ruin of the Irish?" are questions that are often heard nowadays from timid admirers of Erin's struggle for liberty. Mr. George Creel, in the concluding chapter of his recently published volume, "Ireland's Fight for Freedom," has made a good summary of the arguments and statistics which prove that Ireland is thoroughly capable of supporting and governing herself without help or hindrance from England. The reader is first reminded that in area Ireland is twice as large as such independent countries as Belgium, Holland or Switzerland, and has about the same population as Serbia or Greece. In 1915 Ireland's foreign trade represented \$862,000,000, ninety-seven per cent of which, owing to a "clever system of regulations and administrative enactments," was with England. Ireland now pays an annual revenue tax of \$200,000,000, a little more than a fourth of which is spent on Irish government, the rest of the money going to England. Switzerland, it is worthy of note, with a population a million less than Ireland's, governs herself for \$35,000,000 a year. This exploiting of Ireland has been described by the Earl of Dunraven as

A grotesque anachronism . . . divided up between numerous departments, over many of which, some of the most important, the Irish Government has no effective control. These departments overlap and the result is confusion and extravagance. Scotland and Ireland have approximately the same population, yet Ireland pays about \$1,000,000 more than Scotland for her judicial system, \$5,000,000 more for her police; and \$320,000 more for her local government. The Irish police entail an outlay of over \$7,500,000 annually; in other words, the cost of the police for every man, woman and child in arms in Ireland works out an average of \$1.66 per head. The picture of a charge of this amount for keeping in order an infant in arms, to state the case in its most absurd light, is too ridiculous to need statement in further detail when it is borne in mind that crime in Ireland is actually less than in Scotland.

Mr. Creel reaches the conclusion that even if Ireland never recovers the \$2,000,000,000 or more of "overcharges" England exacted from her during the nineteenth century, Erin will be quite capable of "standing alone," provided she is able to keep for herself the \$65,000,000 that now goes out of the country into England every year in rents, interest, salaries and law-costs.

It is high time this tyrannical exploiting of a crushed nation came to an end. The American colonies endured a much milder form of commercial oppression on England's part only twelve years. The Declaration of Independence, it will be remembered, sets down as one of the twenty-eight grievances the American colonies had against George III, his "cutting off our trade with all parts of the world." In 1766 Benjamin Franklin testified before the House of Commons that prior to 1763 the temper of America toward Great Britain was "the best in the world." But the following year the disastrous "change of colonial policy" began with the passage of a "Sugar act" which, without the consent of the Americans, placed a duty on sugar, coffee, wines, silks, etc., coming to the colonies. Eleven years later the series of repressive measures on the part of England culminated in the "Restraining act against all American trade," enacting that "all manner of trade and commerce is and shall be prohibited with the colonies." In less than seven months after the passing of that act the Declaration of Independence was signed. The Irish after enduring for long centuries ruthless financial exploiting by England now plead once more before the bar of the world's opinion simply that they may enjoy the wealth of their own country and only be permitted to "stand alone." No fair-minded and consistent American can deny the Irish this right.

Jury Trial and the "Rabid Drys"

WHAT the Prohibitionists would do, had they the power, the country now knows well, and the lesson should be salutary. The volume of iniquitous legislation they will in future be able to enact, will depend entirely upon the number of Americans in Congress and in the State legislatures. And Americans, real Americans, not Americans only by circumstance of residence or ancestry, are most lamentably rare in this day which welcomes doctrines from which the founders of the Republic would have turned in horror. A provision strongly urged by the "rabid drys," opening the sanctuary of the home to every Paul Pry and peeping Tom, armed with an easily obtained warrant or without a warrant, was defeated by the House Committee, and for the present remains in abeyance. The miserable campaign recalls by contrast the noble words of William Pitt:

The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the winds may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter, but the King of England may not enter. All his forces dare not cross the threshold of that ruined tenement.

Transposing these words to an American key, it may be said that up to the present, the Fourth Amendment, affirming the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, has not been completely repealed by the Prohibitionists. In one respect, this failure to repeal is most unfortunate; yet the significant note is not that this attack on the Constitution failed, but that it was attempted. Scarcely less significant

is the fact that under the Volstead bill, the right of trial by jury is explicitly denied. It is provided in Section 25 that, after conviction, a judge may issue an injunction, and the violator may be punished by a fine of \$1,000 and imprisonment for one year. By a tortuous process of law, the offender will be punished not for selling liquor, his real offense, but for violating an injunction, and in the process, he may not appeal to a jury of his peers. The whole action is not to punish a violation of law, but a violation of an injunction, and the judge who tries the case will be jury and accuser as well as judge.

It is of high importance that offenders against the law be punished fitly, in due time, and for the crimes or misdemeanors of which they are guilty. But it is vastly more important that in vindicating the law, no right of the accused, however small, be disregarded. The law's inequalities are already great enough without adding to them. To punish a man summarily for contempt of court, when his real offense is the violation of a penal law, reveals the chicanery of a process which is certain to breed a contempt of the principle of authority.

The Passing of Dr. Eliot

TWENTY-FIVE years ago, Dr. Eliot of Harvard was acclaimed as a veritable Moses, leading the people into the promised land of electivism. All who would not follow were deemed worthy to be cast out into permanent darkness, with Mohammedans, Jesuits, and other reactionaries and medievalists. But time brings changes, even at Harvard, and it now appears that Dr. Eliot's work was not based on a sound foundation. Speaking at the meeting of the Harvard campaign committee, in terms long familiar to all sane educators, President Lowell roundly condemned the elective system for undergraduates:

It was found that the principle on which the system was founded, was wrong. It was wrong because the student, instead of choosing the subjects in which he was most interested and working at them, generally he was not interested in anything, and therefore sought something easy and diverting. That is not a good way to prepare for life. Preparing for life is something like training for an athletic team. You must work your muscles until they are tired for one, and your brain until it is tired, for the other.

There is nothing particularly novel about this arraignment; yet so far has Harvard electivism corrupted sound principles of education in this country, that it has been received by many as the gospel of a new revelation. To realize that the intellectual interests of the average undergraduate are practically negligible, and to understand that his lack of ripe judgment and sobering experience, utterly unfits him to choose a course of studies for himself, require no great amount of research. All that is necessary is some acquaintance with the ordinary boy of seventeen, but that acquaintance is one of many things that President Eliot never had. What he did possess were first, an unlimited confidence in his own infallibility, and next, a tireless press-agent. Working persistently

and in harmony, the two have almost succeeded in making American college education a farce, and American scholarship a byword among European savants.

The harm done by Dr. Eliot cannot be repaired by a word from Dr. Lowell. The evil is too deeply rooted in the majority of American colleges, and with its unique appeal to human weakness, is likely long to remain there. Dr. Eliot was long hailed as our "greatest educator," but he will be best remembered for his attempt to establish as fundamental in college education the principle that training is best secured by moving along the lines of least resistance.

Powder-and-Paint Engagements

AMONG the "memorundrums" of Bob Scarlet, it may be recalled, which little Dorothy of "The Admiral's Caravan" chanced to find, were these:

Will Moles molest a mounted mink?
Do Newts deny the news?
Are Oysters boisterous when they drink?
Do Parrots prowl in pews?
Do Quakers get their quills from Quails?
Do Rabbits rob on roads?
Are Snakes supposed to sneer at snails?
Do Tortoises tease toads?
Can Unicorns perform on horns?
Do Vipers value veal?
Do Weasels weep when fast asleep?
Can Xylophagans squeal?
Do Yaks in packs invite attacks?
Are Zebras full of zeal?

"I don't believe I know a single one of the answers," exclaimed Dorothy despairingly. But Bob Scarlet did. It was a terse, emphatic "no!" A like answer should be made those silly girls of today who seem to think that good husbands can be won and a happy married life guaranteed by all young women who have mastered the art of using adroitly the rouge-box and the powder-puff. "An instant's beauty may mean lasting happiness," confidently declares the manufacturer of a widely advertised cosmetic. He then gives his prospective patron elaborate directions for covering her face with successive layers of cream and paint and powder, all with the object of filling a wavering suitor with such a sudden and irresistible admiration for her beauty that he will find himself unescapably engaged before he knows it. So the credulous readers of such advertisements, in the hope that "an instant of flashing beauty, of healthful glowing color" will "capture love," spend on costly and injurious cosmetics hard-earned money which should be used to buy nourishing food and suitable clothing. Girls who are so intent upon adorning the outside of their heads that the inside is left quite bare of furniture will be unable to keep for long the love of any sensible man and the engagement that is chiefly due to the clever manipulation of cream and paint and powder is not likely to be followed by a happy marriage. The love that owes its origin to cosmetics is the "love which alters when it alteration finds."

Literature

JESUIT EXPLORER AND "CATTLE-KING"

IN the March of 1687 at the moment when the career of the French explorer, Robert Cavalier de La Salle, came to such a tragic end in the wilds of Texas, the Jesuit missionary Father Eusebio Francisco Kino began his labors in the territory then known as *Primeria Alta*, on the Sonora River, near the present Arizona line. While the names of La Salle and the Jesuit missionaries of the north, Jogues and Marquette, Lalemant and Brébeuf, are household words even to those who are acquainted only with the fringes of American history, serious students of our early annals are scarcely familiar with the accomplishments of this extraordinary man, one of the greatest explorers of the Far West. But henceforth no student of the growth of civilization in the present territory of the United States can have any excuse for remaining in ignorance of the labors of this rival of the blackrobes who brought the Faith to the Algonquins and Hurons, or died for it amid the wigwams of the Iroquois. For Mr. Herbert Eugene Bolton, of the University of California, has lately added as a contribution to the "Spain in the West Series" two meaty volumes: "Kino's Historical Memoir of *Pimeria Alta*" (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clarke Company), a contemporary account of the beginnings of California, Arizona and Sonora, by this emulator of Xavier and Claver and picturesquely styled by Mr. Bolton, "Pioneer Missionary, Explorer, Cartographer and Ranchman."

For a century and a half the manuscript of Kino's historical memoir had been lost sight of. Eleven years ago it was discovered by Professor Bolton in the national archives of the City of Mexico. It is now given to the public in an English translation as scholarly in its interpretation of the original, as it is fascinating in the content of the story. Not in size, but in its spirit and the valuable ethnological, tribal, geographical and linguistic information which it gives it recalls the "Relations" of the Jesuit missionaries of the North. The spirit of the West and Southwest breathes over the pages of Kino just as unmistakably as that of the snow-mantled valleys and the reaches of the St. Lawrence speaks to us in the letters of the brethren of Lejeune and Biart in the "Relations." Kino is as alive to the new aspects of life around him in the tribes along the Gila, as were his brethren along the Richelieu or the Mohawk. Like them he notices the physical characteristics of the country, its flora and fauna. He catalogues flower and fern, draws map and chart, and classifies with the infallible instinct of the traveler and the trapper the tribes of the Red Men by whose camp fires he slept for a quarter of a century. Father Kino's memoir, as Professor Bolton well says, is "a continuous account of an entire historical movement of great importance, covering a period of more than twenty years, from the pen of the principal actor."

Kino was to the tribes of California, of Arizona and Sonora what Smet was to the Red Men of the Northwest, Brébeuf to Huron and Algonquin, Marquette to the tribes along the Mississippi, what in our own days Lacombe was to the Indians of the Northwest. Although he toiled in Spanish territory, under Spanish rule and methods, in that Spanish atmosphere of stern reality wedded to romance and chivalry marred at times by cruelty, Kino was not by birth or early training a Spaniard. He was born in the Valley of Nonsburg, near Trent, in the Austrian Tyrol, in 1644. At the universities of Ingolstadt and Freiburg he distinguished himself by his scientific and mathematical skill, and when a career of worldly success seemed to be opening out to him, he sadly disappointed his friends and admirers by entering the Society of Jesus at the Novitiate of Landsberg, of the Province of Upper Germany, in 1665. For more than a decade he did what thousands of Jesuits have

been doing for the last 350 years. He studied, he taught, he prepared himself for his future life-work, the labors of the foreign missions, for which he had always longed. In 1681 his hopes were realized. After a long and tedious voyage, together with a band of Jesuits, in which Tyrolean, Welshman, Italian, Hollander, Bohemian and Austrian joined together for the conquest of souls, gave tangible evidence of the universality of the Faith they were bringing to the New World, he landed in New Spain. He was not too exhausted to engage on his arrival in a friendly scientific conquest with a brother-Jesuit, Siguenza y Gongora, on the subject of the comet whose sudden arrival had stirred the capital of Spain's immense empire in the West, already famous for her schools and learning. The scientific accomplishments and the intellectual vigor then displayed by Father Kino, and that magnetism which was to serve him so faithfully in *Alta Pimeria* brought him to the notice of the Viceroy, the Marquis de la Laguna.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Spain which we have rather grudgingly paid. Spain was the great pioneer nation of the New World. From the palm groves of San Salvador, from the Rio Colorado to the Andes and Cape Horn, her name is carved on mountain, headland and cape in imperishable memorials of her great discoverers and hardy explorers. To the South, Spaniards were the first to gaze upon the Pacific from the heights of Darien; Spanish blades carved out in Mexico and Peru, empires not much inferior in wealth to all that was known of the riches of Eastern kings; Spanish canoes were the first to bear the white man down the Orinoco and the Amazon; the hymns of Catholic Spain were the first to be lifted in praise to the true God in the old palaces of the Incas, long before the language that was Shakespeare's was heard amid the plantations of Virginia or the bleak hills of New England. Spanish galleons had sailed round the world long before the ships of Drake or Hawkins had dipped their prows in the Spanish Main. Half a century before the Mayflower anchored off Plymouth Rock, Alvar Nuñez de Vaca had blazed his way through tangled forest and worse than Serbonian bog across the North American continent from the lagoons of Florida to the Gulf of California, where Kino would follow. When in 1607 the first permanent English settlement was made at Jamestown, Spain held sway over an empire in Florida and Mexico; she had colonized not only the American seaboard but hewn her way through forest and jungle, over river and morass, from northeastern Kansas to Buenos Ayres, and from the outposts on the Atlantic to the Gulf of California.

The Spaniard was not only a discoverer and a colonizer, he was as Kino always showed himself to be, an educator and a civilizer. At times, no doubt, he showed but little mercy to the tribes that blocked his path. But he was far more lenient to them than the Anglo-Saxon was to the Pequods or the Sioux. Moreover, the Spaniard taught the Indian the religion of Christ and rivals of Kino, like Quiroga, Toribio and Louis Bertrand spent their lives for their material and spiritual welfare. With the Spaniard, literature and art came to the New World. Under Spanish viceroys Lima and Mexico rivaled Ferrara and Venice in refinement and letters; cathedrals, worthy sisters of the churches of old Spain, rose not only in Guatemala and Carthage, but in Asuncion and La Paz. A printing press in Mexico City, great universities in Central and South America were almost a century old when the "Bay Psalm-Book" was printed in New England and John Harvard laid the foundations of his school at Cambridge.

Father Kino was a man to mingle in all this life of adventure, of romantic daring and spiritual conquest. He was of a courage and endurance that made him the envy of the hardy

explorers with whom he rode through hostile tribes along the Gila and the Colorado. He gave proofs of it when as a member of the ill-starred expedition of Atondo he went to Lower California with a commission from the viceroy naming him the cartographer of the troop, or when, almost alone, he faced the revolted Pimas in the Altar Valley, or when with two or three companions he explored the Colorado River. His endurance in the saddle, says Professor Bolton, was not unworthy of a "seasoned cowboy." On a "trip" to the City of Mexico, he made the journey in fifty-three days, traveling not less than 1500 miles, or on an average of nearly thirty miles a day. In 1700 he rode over 1000 miles in twenty-six days or nearly forty miles a day. When almost sixty he traveled for more than a month making over thirty miles a day. Kino was a spiritual Kit Carson, a frontiersman of the Lord, who would have fitted admirably in any picture that framed such national heroes as Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone or Natty Bumppo. There clung to his Jesuit's robe something of the wild aroma of the plains, of the mystery of the gorges and canyons through which he fearlessly rode to round up his flock along the Altar, the Gila, the Colorado, the San Miguel Rivers, to the head of the great western gulf.

If he settled a long disputed question and proved conclusively that Lower California was a peninsula and furnished valuable data as to the geography and ethnography of these territories, he considered these results as only the secondary objects of his journeyings. He looked for his Indians not merely to bring them material advantages, but the light and the civilization of the Gospel. He was a great missionary. He knew the Indians of the Gila and Santa Cruz regions, of Sonora, and Alta Pimeria as few spiritual explorers, even as Margil or De Smet knew the Red Man. He lived their lives, spoke their tongues, and though one of gentle ways and tender-heart, had all their Spartan stoicism, heightened by his Catholic asceticism and Jesuit calm in the face of hunger and cold, danger and death.

Missionary, explorer, cartographer and priest, Kino was something more. He was the "cattle-king" of his day, one of the founders of the great western ranches. Interesting as are the two volumes of his historical memoir, there are no paragraphs so startling to the reader as those of Professor Bolton himself, in which he tells us of Father Kino's skill as a stockman and a ranchman. Another for Hector! Another bit of Jesuit commercial enterprise and business-craft. It may not be denied, for "within fifteen years Kino established the beginnings of ranching in the valleys of the Magdalena, the Altar, the Santa Cruz, the San Pedro and the Sonoita. The stock-raising industry of nearly twenty places on the modern map owes its beginnings on a considerable scale to this indefatigable man." It must not be supposed, adds Professor Bolton, with that fairness which everywhere characterizes his work, that the missionary had turned ranchman for his own private gain. His ranches and his stock were but the centers and the material for the food-supplies for his Indians, who practically without the help of a white man, superintended and herded them. It was a wise measure on Kino's part. It was an attempt to make the missions self-supporting and economically independent.

Cattle-king though he was—for his subjects' benefit, not his own—millionaire ranchman perhaps, Eusebio Francisco Kino died as a Jesuit should die, in poverty, and as a son of the plains and a brother of the Red Man should pass away to meet the "Great Spirit," a rude skin spread under him, an Indian blanket covering his frame wasted by many a hard ride to round up his dusky children, and a saddle for his pillow. He died in 1711 at Magdalena. He had spent twenty-four years in Pimeria. In forty expeditions covering more than 20,000 miles he had traversed it from end to end, not only in the interests of science and civilization, but above all for the souls

of the Red Men. His name and exploits in the cause of religion and humanity have for some time been, not indeed forgotten entirely, but partially obscured. They are now restored to the place of honor which they so justly deserve.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S. J.

REVIEWS

Observations in the Orient. The Account of a Journey to Catholic Mission Fields in Japan, Korea, Manchuria, China, Indo-China and the Philippines. By the Very Reverend JAMES A. WALSH, Superior of Maryknoll. Published by Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America. Ossining, New York: \$2.00.

When Father Walsh set out from Maryknoll last September for the Far East, he started a journal which he faithfully kept until his return home four months ago. His "pioneer's log" is now published entire in this very readable and lavishly illustrated book. The author makes a thoughtful survey of the work the Church is doing in the Orient, gives striking descriptions of the hardships the missionaries cheerfully endure, purely out of love for souls, and sums up at the end of the volume the conclusions he reached regarding the success American priests are likely to have in China and Japan. The latter country Father Walsh does not consider a very promising field just now for Catholic missionary enterprises. For Nippon's rapid advance to the position of a world-power has made the natives "too proud to listen to the voice of the Carpenter's Son." But the Chinese he finds with "qualities of mind and heart as well as religious traditions that fit them for the Christian Faith." Accordingly Maryknoll's first missionary center in the East was started by four American priests at Yeungkong, in the province of Kwangtung, last Christmas.

The prime purpose of Father Walsh's book is to awaken the enthusiastic interest of his fellow-Catholics in the new American mission. This the volume's 323 pages of text and eighty pages of photographs are well calculated to do, for the author knows how to describe entertainingly the sights he saw and to relate pleasantly the many adventures he had during his six-months' sojourn in the East. "Go away slowly" is the polite request with which little Chinese Catholics whom Father Walsh met bade him good-by. Readers who reluctantly come to the end of his "Observations in the Orient" will understand what the little Celestials meant.

W. D.

1914. By FIELD-MARSHAL VISCOUNT FRENCH of Ypres, K. P., O. M. With a Preface by MARSHAL FOCH and With Portrait and Maps. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. \$6.00.

Since the dawn of peace everyone has been curious to learn the real facts of the war. General French's book is the first from the pen of any of the Commanding Generals of the Allies and it deals with operations of the British armies under his command during the year 1914. The retreat from Mons, the battles of the Marne and Aisne, the fall of Antwerp and the first battle of Ypres where the original British force was all but annihilated, are pictured in these pages. The munition shortage in the early days of the war and General French's opinions of the mistakes of Government are set down frankly and fearlessly. The scanty supply of munitions of war hampered the General in the field and ruined all power of initiative up to the close of 1915. After every effort had failed to awaken the War Office to the serious situation the British army was in, a situation that imperiled the Empire itself, General French made his decision in May, 1915, and gave interviews to the press and urged public men to place the army's needs directly before the people. It meant the overthrow of the Government and it meant too the end of the General's career in France, "with all the hopes and ambitions that only a soldier can un-

derstand." General French offers no apology for his unprecedented action. No other course was open to him. Only by organizing the industrial resources of Great Britain on an enormous scale could victory in the field be achieved. The aftermath proved his contention, and when America entered the conflict she profited by the mistakes of the British Government's policy. The volume has aroused much controversy, Mr. Asquith being particularly violent in his denunciations of the author.

G. C. T.

John Ayscough's Letters to His Mother during 1914, 1915 and 1916. Edited with an Introduction by FRANK BICKERSTAFFE-DREW. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. \$2.50.

In July, 1916, Mrs. Charles Brent, the tenderly-loved mother of Mgr. Bickerstaffe-Drew, the well-known Catholic novelist, passed to a better life at the ripe age of eighty-seven. The outbreak of the war separated her chaplain-son from her and sent him to France, where he distinguished himself first near the battle-line and later by his services in military hospitals. Almost every day Mgr. Bickerstaffe-Drew sent a letter to his mother and most of them are here published, having been edited by the writer's nephew. As the letters were written for a dotting mother to whom every single thing her son did, said or thought was a matter of the highest importance, they do not always hold the interest of the general reader, but "John Ayscough's" clever touch is often in evidence. He describes in a chatty way the routine of his hospital life, writes entertainingly of the titled folk he meets, and tells for his mother's amusement anecdotes about eminent historical personages whose homes or haunts he visits. Some of the incidents described in the early part of the book, the author turned into good literary material in his admirable war-book, "French Windows," for instance, that German prisoner, "such a baby, with such childish manners, yet fully conscious that he was dying and quite cheerful about it—only hopping with eagerness at sight of a priest." The book's frontispiece is a fine medallion of "John Ayscough's Mother."

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Sisters and teachers who have already begun to wonder what sort of Christmas entertainment they will get up this year would do well to read Miss Katherine Brégy's "The Little Crusaders, a Drama of the Children's Crusade" (Peter Reilly, 133 N. 13th St., Philadelphia, \$0.35). The play is a "dream-story" consisting of prologue, two acts and epilogue and calling for a cast of fifteen characters, with as many extra boys and girls as may be desired. The play presents with great dramatic effect the sad story of the thousands of French and German children who in the thirteenth century traveled on foot to Brindisi in the hope of sailing thence to Palestine and delivering the Holy Land from the Turk.—"The Magic Horse-Hair" (Talbot Press, Dublin), by James A. Wightman, is an illustrated book for children which pleasantly tells first how little Paddy Dolan received the horse-hair from the leprechaun and then how that talisman got the boy out of seven grave predicaments.

"The Gay-Dombey's" (Macmillan, \$1.75) by Sir Harry Johnston will greatly disappoint those lovers of Dickens who are looking for a continuation of the tale told by the master. Despite the puffery of H. G. Wells, Sir Harry has only compiled a wearisome chronicle of the lives of stupid people. A psychological analysis of stupidity would not be without value, but Sir Harry can do no more than sketch an outline. The chief merit of his novel is to demonstrate by contrast the infinite superiority of Dickens to the dull copyists who gain the attention of the passing crowd by lurid advertising.—"Abraham Lincoln: A Play"

(Houghton, Mifflin, \$1.25) by John Drinkwater may be excellent propaganda, but it is surely mediocre drama. Mr. Drinkwater's negro dialect, which a wiser man would have avoided, is constructed according to a simple formula. He omits all verbs; the result, while novel, is not convincing. Illinois farmers of 1860 ejaculate "My word!" in the most approved British style, preface their statements with "I dare say," and Susan, the handmaid of the Springfield establishment, always refers to Lincoln as "the master." Historians will be interested to learn that it was not Robert E. Lee, but Stonewall Jackson, who suppressed John Brown at Harper's Ferry in 1859.

"Busy, The Life of an Ant" (Harper), by Walter Flavius McCaleb, is the autobiography of an ant written in a popular style. It is difficult to discern whether the author intended to give the life-history of ants in general or to describe the *modus vivendi* of a particular species. "Busy" is a "red-headed, salmon-colored ant." He possesses a sting which he uses as a weapon of defense against beetle enemies, though beetles are more commonly the prey of these predacious little creatures who hunt them for food. Busy is a worker, and to prevent any misunderstanding that might arise from the use of the masculine pronoun in referring to the subject of the biography, the author in a foot-note offers the information: "It is of course well known that the worker ants are females." Busy has a nurse, Nitsy, also a worker, who writes the last chapter in Busy's life history. He died defending a queen from the assault of a horrible beetle. It was Nitsy's sad task to perform the obsequies. She "laid him in a bed at the feet of a flower of the sun." Mr. McCaleb endeavors to humanize the ant, but no single fact or aggregate of facts in Busy's life warrant the assumption that the species is endowed with a rational soul. Busy is just a plain, ordinary ant, and exhibits none but the ordinary habits of instinct proper to its kind. Nothing is said of the neuters, and Busy has rendered a rather incomplete history of the life of an ant.

The August *Catholic World* offers its readers a very appetizing menu. Father Cuthbert writes on "Catholic Social Study," Dr. Reilly notes "The Passing of Kipling," Father Aveling describes "Armistice Days" from the Catholic chaplain's point of view, Father Martindale continues his excellent directions about "How to Read St. John's Gospel" and Mr. Brickel draws a strong parallel between "Cardinal Newman and Edmund Burke." "T. J. S.'s" "An Answer" well expresses this striking thought:

The crossroads cross through Christ, Himself the Cross,
Only in Him our paths of love may meet,
The hungering heart must rest its hope complete
On Christ or know the bitterness of loss.

Sunk deep in common earth, yet raised to heaven,
Embracing North and South and East and West,
His arms have gathered in, received and blessed
Whatever love from heart to heart is given.

Standing at roads where meet our hearts forlorn
His priest, of souls a lover great shall be:
A cross himself raised high on Calvary
That shadows forth Love's Resurrection morn.

In the "With Our Readers" department is an indignant and well-reasoned protest against the late recrudescence of indecent films and books that has afflicted the country and the writer has this to say about Galsworthy's salacious novel, "Saint's Progress": "This book is a subtle attack on everything which the traditional Christian world has held sacred. It denies Christ and the value of His teaching: it denies God: it denies personal immortality: it denies personal responsibility: it denies morality and it presents sex-indulgence as the only real true life that man knows."

EDUCATION

Senator Smith Shatters the Silence

SENATOR HOKE SMITH of Georgia can talk longer on the subject of the bill for the enthronement of a Federal educational dictator, and say less in reply to all who think an autocracy of any kind out of place at Washington, than any man now living. In proof of this assertion I respectfully submit as Exhibit A, pages 3418 to 3423 included, of that useful journal the *Congressional Record* for July 28. Senator Smith is both grieved and surprised that any American can object to the bill bearing his name, but prepared by the National Educational Association, and on the wings of his grief rises to a plane familiar to readers of the *Menace* and other champions of un-American propaganda. From this high altitude he sees clearly that those supposedly earnest men and women who find in the Smith bill the most dangerous menace to constitutional government that has yet appeared in this country, are, in reality, to be classed with "those who believe that ignorance on part of the masses increases religious faith." "These attacks," continues the statesman from Georgia, "might have been expected of leaders of thought in the Dark Ages," St. Thomas Aquinas, for example, or Dante, or the builder of Reims, "but at the present time they are surprising and shocking."

STATE AUTONOMY DESTROYED

THE grief and surprise which rend the bosom of Senator Smith must awaken a responsive throb in the hearts of all pitiful men, but viewed logically, they cannot be considered as arguments in favor of an educational dictator at Washington. They prove, these tears and shudders, if they prove anything, either that Senator Smith is unacquainted with the measure which bears his name, or that he grievously errs in asserting that by the terms of the bill "no autocratic overseer of education is created in Washington." To a certain extent, I readily admit, Senator Smith is right in this contention; his proposed Secretary of Education is no mere "overseer." To quote from a forgotten classic, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," he is not Sambo or Quimbo, but Simon Legree himself. In the all-star aggregation proposed by Senator Smith, the roles of Sambo and Quimbo, degraded "overseers" who hold their places by pandering to the vices of Simon, will be played in turn by the respective States, who come, hat in hand, to beg their dole at the postern gate of the old manse inhabited by Simon, the Secretary of Education.

Nor am I particularly impressed by the capital letters which the Senator and the public printer have invoked to give force and impressiveness to certain sections of the bill. A weed, by whatever name you call it, is a rank thing, and I am far more deeply moved by certain sections following this pyrotechnical display of the linotype's resources. It is worse than trifling to capitalize the assertion that "all the educational facilities . . . shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities of said State," when, in point of fact, no State can "cooperate" with the Federal Government and receive therefor Federal money, unless this organization, supervision and administration, is submitted to, and approved by, the proposed Secretary of Education. Does Senator Smith think that the opponents of his bill cannot read? By the terms of his bill, the States may do precisely what they wish with their schools, provided always, that their desires are in exact accord with the orders of the Secretary of Education. That is the extent of their large "freedom."

THE BILL CREATES A DICTATOR

THIS is not mere assertion. It should be remembered, as has been pointed out time and again in these columns, that the Smith bill enumerates the activities which it affects to "encour-

age," but in reality dictates. These are, the instruction of illiterates, the Americanization of the immigrant, the partial payment of teachers' salaries, the extension of the school term and higher standards of teaching, new rural schools, the promotion of physical and health education, the preparation of teachers, and the adaptation of public libraries for educational purposes, all of which, except the last, are interests now controlled by the public and private school authorities of the respective States. Under the Smith bill, this control passes from the local to the Federal authorities, for the bill clearly empowers the Secretary of Education to judge whether or not the courses of study prescribed by a given State are of a proper standard, and, in general, to decide upon the fitness of a State, as evinced by its preparation of teachers and the support of its schools, to share in the Federal apportionments.

Should the Secretary rule that the State of New York, for instance, because of the school programs and standards of teacher-training which it has adopted, is not "prepared to carry out the provisions of this act," then, by Section 14, the State of New York will get no money from the Federal Government until it has changed its courses of study and standards of teacher-training to conform with the orders of the Secretary of Education. Furthermore, supposing that the humble application of the State of New York has been graciously approved by the Secretary, it is always within the power of this official, to rule that the funds thereafter appropriated have not been used by New York, "for the purpose for which they have been appropriated." Any changes, therefore, either in the courses of study or in the provisions for the training of teachers which the State may wish to make, must be first approved at Washington. Finally, by Section 15, "the Secretary of Education may withhold the apportionment or apportionments of any State *whenever he shall determine* that such apportionment or apportionments made to said State for the current fiscal year are not being expended in accordance with the provisions of this act," and he may take the same action in case a State fails to file an annual report (Section 17) showing how the provisions of the act are being carried out.

It is not to be supposed that these rulings will be made arbitrarily. The Secretary will issue his orders only after an inspection of the schools and of the courses of study in a given State, has convinced him that the State in question must submit to the changes ordered at Washington, or be cut off from all Federal "aid." If the political appointee who, solely and with finality, can order a State to change its school programs, revise its plans for the training of teachers, pass upon its fitness to reduce illiteracy and to "Americanize" the immigrant through its educational facilities, is not an educational dictator, then we are forced to choose between the definition assumed by Senator Smith and the definition given in Webster's "Unabridged."

SENATOR THOMAS ON THE BILL

THE happiest result, however, of Senator Smith's speech on July 28, was the rejoinder which it brought forth from Senator Thomas. As the Associated Press, which carried a synopsis of the assertions of Senator Smith, was not interested in the argument presented by Senator Thomas, the remarks of the Senator from Colorado are here submitted.

"Mr. President, I have listened with close attention to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia upon the so-called Smith-Towner bill. The objections to the bill which he has discussed seem to me to be untenable; but I have been impressed with the fact that this bill, if enacted into law, however carefully it is drawn and whatever limitations may be originally placed upon the subject, will be the beginning of a policy of transferring to the General Government complete jurisdiction over the cause of education. The attractive feature of the bill to those who are very actively engaged at present in cultivating a propaganda for it—for I am getting multitudes of letters identical in expression

in favor of it—is the fact that it carries an appropriation of \$100,000,000. That is a bait, Mr. President, which few men in this country can resist at this time, particularly when these benefits are to be shed like the dews of heaven over the just and the unjust in all the States and Territories of the Union.

I believe in the education of the people of the United States and of their children, as I believe in the cause of education everywhere, but I am also profoundly convinced that one of the things that the States reserved to themselves and which is essential to their integrity and to the integrity of the cause of local self-government is their continued retention of jurisdiction over the education of the people within their borders.

"I know that it may be said that this duty has in large degree been neglected in certain portions of the country in the past and is now being neglected. I know that it is claimed, with perfect truth, that the percentage of illiteracy in some sections of the country is simply appalling and that it constitutes a menace to the integrity of the nation. That is to say, that the States are not functioning; that is to say, that the Government must assume the obligations of discharging the duties of the States wherever the States themselves fail, in whole or in part, in assuming the obligation themselves."

"WHY HAVE STATES AT ALL"

"THE tendency of the Federal Government to extend its powers and activities far beyond the original purposes contemplated is a tendency which is encouraged by the people of the States of the Union whenever it appears that the extension carries with it the assumption of the financial obligation which the discharge of the duty involves. I know of no reason if this is a logical movement, why we should not have a minister of police as a member of the Cabinet of the President, to whom should be given the authority of enforcing police regulations throughout the country, the States themselves being negligent or indifferent or sometimes wholly failing in the discharge of that local obligation. I know of no reason why we should have States at all if this tendency is to continue, and particularly if it is to continue with the encouragement of the people of the States. If that is to be the policy of the United States hereafter, let us make one bite at the cherry and establish in the city of Washington a department for all of the local activities of the country."

"MR. KING: And wipe out the States?"

"MR. THOMAS: It would wipe out the States. It is being done through the constant operation of what might be called the law of political gravity; and it may be entirely useless, probably it is, for those of us who believe that there should be some semblance of authority left to the States to contend against this manifest movement. The fact is that in some sections of the country, if I can judge from the letters which I have received upon this subject, people have come to the conclusion that the Government has heretofore been extremely remiss in not taking over these agencies and relieving the local government from the consequent burden of taxation."

"BUREAUCRATIZED EDUCATION"

"THE Senator from Georgia has so drawn this bill that the activities of the States are to continue and the revenues raised for educational purposes are not to be diminished; but the Government, out of its inexhaustible revenues, is to begin with the trifle of \$100,000,000 in supplementing educational funds. I make the prediction that within 10 or 15 years from now, largely through the action of the States themselves, this obligation will be more and more imposed upon the shoulders of the Federal Government until by that time education in the United States will be bureaucratized and subjected to all of the evils of bureaucracy, with its concomitants of red tape, multitudinous officials, and inefficiency which during the war were

brought so startlingly to the attention of the country in regard to matters military. . . . So, when this bill is enacted, as it probably will be—for no doubt the \$100,000,000 lure will be sufficient to get votes enough to pass it in both Houses—the Senators upon this floor who are perhaps 15 to 20 years younger than I am will in all probability live to see everything affecting education throughout this country emanating from general headquarters in the city of Washington, and necessarily passing through the manifold processes and subdivisions of an organized bureaucracy.

"This, Mr. President, in brief, is the basis of the objection that I shall offer to the passage of this bill when it comes up for final consideration."

But is not Senator Thomas unduly pessimistic in his prophecy that "the lure of gold" will be strong enough to enact this bill into law? A long pull, a strong pull, a pull all together, a pull not political but for the defense of American ideals, and we shall hear no more of the Smith-Towner bill for the establishment of the most dangerous of all autocracies.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

The Limits of Public Ownership

I AM writing this article in England where proposals for the "nationalization" of industries are being pressed by energetic advocates. The Government is committed to the nationalization of the railways, and the nationalization of the coal mines is being considered by a Royal Commission. Nationalization of the mines and the railways would mean the two greatest industries of the country in Government hands. In America, the term "public ownership" is preferred to nationalization, but the questions at issue are the same. It is quite evident that as State Socialism means the public ownership of the means of production, these great extensions of public ownership take us in the direction of Socialism. Assuming that a Catholic cannot be a Socialist, it may be asked how far can a Catholic go in advocacy of public ownership. When do extensions of public ownership of the means of production become Socialistic in character and effect?

It must be admitted that there is nothing inherently wrong in public ownership. Municipal gasworks, State-owned mines, Government monopolies of telegraphs and railways are all legitimate from the point of view of Catholic doctrine. Where must public ownership stop in order that private ownership may be conserved and Socialism prevented?

JUST ACQUISITION

ONE limit to public ownership is set by the possibility of lawful acquisition by the State of given industrial enterprises. The State may take over the railways, for example, if it can provide just compensation for the dispossessed private owners. On the same terms the State can take the mines, and the telegraphs, and the steel factories, and the film factories. Provided that the means of acquisition are just there is nothing intrinsically wrong about State ownership and operation of these industries.

The limits to State ownership, set by the possibilities of just acquisition, are closer than most people imagine. There is a popular idea that the State has boundless credit and resources with which to buy out private capitalists as it pleases. This idea is fallacious; the resources of the State are not boundless. Usually when the State "nationalizes" a private undertaking, it borrows the purchase money by the issue of bonds, and it expects to pay interest and sinking-fund on the bonds out of the earnings of the undertaking when managed by the State. This seems simple, but in the first place there is not always money to be borrowed for purchasing purposes, and in the second place,

there are not always earnings from the nationalized industry with which to repay the loan. For example, at the present time in England there is no money that the State can borrow in order to buy the mines. The Miners' Federation, the great labor union which is trying to force nationalization, recognizes this, and therefore it does not propose that the State should give compensation in cash to the dispossessed mine-owners. It proposes to give them only State certificates entitling them to receive a certain sum of money from the State for a certain number of years. The State certificates are not cash, though the holders can sell them for cash if they can find buyers. In this scheme of nationalization, it will be seen that not only does the State forcibly expropriate the owners, but it levies on them a forced loan. The State cannot buy them out any other way. Is this treating the owners justly, to force them to sell and to force them to lend? Such a procedure can only be justified under abnormal circumstances. Yet the State is driven to this manner of acting if it would carry nationalization very far. Therefore, a limit to nationalization is set by the means of State acquisition. The more the sphere of nationalization expands and the more the sphere of private ownership contracts, the less possible does it become for the State to borrow from free lenders in order to pay cash to those who are expropriated.

THE QUESTION OF COMPENSATION

WE have seen that when nationalization goes beyond a certain point, the *method* of compensation (i.e., a forced loan) becomes so onerous to the private interests involved, as to be normally unjustifiable. Nothing has been said about the amount of compensation. This may be just or unjust to the expropriated owners, according to the particular scheme, but a Government resorting to forced loans is only too likely to pay inadequate compensation and thus to be guilty of added injustice.

Another important point is that with the expansion of nationalized industry and a corresponding contraction of private industry, the dispossessed owners find it more and more difficult to re-invest the money they receive on being bought out. The very logic of the process is for private ownership to be displaced by public ownership of the means of production. If the dispossessed owners cannot re-invest they have been made to exchange productive for non-productive property. This is a hardship to the individuals concerned, and perhaps an injustice. In any case, it is bad economy for the community to encourage the consumption of goods rather than their conversion into capital.

When an enquirer says "You oppose Socialism, yet you admit some government ownership; where would you have government ownership to stop?" I am content to reply: "Government ownership will not go beyond what justice permits provided that the Government in dispossessing private owners observes the rules of equitable compensation." This answer is conclusive in its way, though it does not deal with the more fundamental questions of why private ownership is a right and why it must be respected and maintained. There are illogical Socialists who cherish the illusion that Socialism can be established without confiscating, by a gradual process of buying out, by compensating. In other words they believe that the land and capital of a country can be transferred from private owners to the State without leaving the private owners any worse off! They fail to see that a point comes when the State finds itself unable to give the private owners anything equivalent in value to what it takes from them. The State cannot pay market price, or indeed any price at all in cash, but it must simply force the expropriated to accept the State's I. O. U. in the fashion now proposed by the British Miners' Federation. We may be secure in our minds that whatever the wisdom or unwisdom of particular schemes of nationalization we shall never have enough public ownership

to constitute a condition of Socialism until we see the State taking over private industries on confiscatory terms.

HENRY SOMERVILLE.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The French Clergy in the War

RECENT figures given by *La Croix* place the number of French ecclesiastics killed during the war at 3,276. Nearly 1,000 received the decoration of the Legion of Honor, 383 received the Military Medal and 7,848 the Croix de Guerre. The Jesuits who were exiled by the French Republic in the name of liberty returned to France from all over the world. It is estimated that 900 were serving with the colors. The decoration of the Legion of Honor was bestowed on 62 Jesuits, 39 received the Military Medal, 310 the Croix de Guerre. Moreover, there were 595 who received citations in the Orders of the Day. There has been no indication that France is going to restore to the positions of citizens those of her children who cheerfully came back from the lands where they were exiled to fight for her.

Peace Convention of the Knights of Columbus

SOME of the progressive measures discussed at the Peace Convention recently held at Buffalo by the Knights of Columbus were a night-school plan and a recreational center program. The night-school plan is an endeavor to come to the help of those who have not had the advantages of education or who wish to take additional cultural or practical courses of study. The units of activity in this new educational effort of the Knights will be the councils. The recreational plan has to do with the establishment of clubs throughout the country. The club at Utica, New York, with its modern gymnastic and athletic equipment, will serve as a model for similar recreational centers. Its cost was \$150,000. In Columbus, Ohio, the Knights have recently raised \$325,000 for a recreation center. The splendid success of the Knights' war activities, attested by soldiers and sailors of all creeds, guarantees a happy issue to their peace program.

Report of the Association of the Holy Childhood

FROM May 1, 1918, to April 30, 1919, the Association of the Holy Childhood received \$119,827.70, according to the official report just issued from the Central Office at Pittsburgh. Once every year the American Central Office forwards the contributions to the General Council of the Association at Paris. This council consists of fifteen priests and fifteen laymen representing the different national centers of the Association. The distribution of funds to the missions is made by the international council subject to the approval of the Cardinal Protector at Rome. At present the Association supports 280 Missions, that are directed by various Religious Orders and Congregations and embrace every nationality. The contributions received are entirely employed in procuring Baptism for pagan infants in danger of death, and in buying children doomed to slavery or death. The rescued children are supported and educated by the Association. The chief financial support of the Holy Childhood Association comes from the membership dues of Catholic children throughout the world. The conditions of membership are very simple. A daily recitation of one Hail Mary with the invocation, "Holy Virgin Mary, pray for us and the poor pagan children," and the monthly dues of one cent. No Catholic Sunday school or day school should be without its branch of the Holy Childhood Association.